

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is a constant output of books on the *Origins of the Gospels*, but on so rapidly growing a subject a constant output is as desirable as it is inevitable. We offer a special welcome to a book recently written under this title by Professor Floyd V. Filson of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago. For it is all that it is claimed to be, a readable, non-technical, and up-to-date survey and evaluation of recent trends in the study of Gospel origins.

As Professor C. Grant of Union Theological Seminary says in his Foreword, the book surveys the whole range of modern Gospel research, and gathers together in brief compass its chief results during the two generations just past. In addition to this, the author writes from a standpoint of earnest personal faith, which leads him to point out the concrete application of 'critical' results, and to show their value in preaching and teaching.

We shall here take account only of the first chapter or lecture, which treats of the subject of 'The Minister and Gospel Criticism.' The author begins with an analysis of the reasons for the minister's failure to follow developments in Gospel criticism. These may be tabulated as want of time, his consciousness of being primarily a preacher, his feeling that the results of critical research are a hindrance rather than a help to his work, his observation of the lack of agreement among scholars, and the difficulty of finding a clear statement of the present situation in Gospel criticism.

None the less, an effort should, it is urged, be made

to close the gap between research and practical ministry. One reason for this is that if the minister reveals himself an utter amateur in Biblical research, his last area of specialized competence is challenged: to-day technical competence is looked for in each profession. Another reason is that, if the minister has learned to catch the original import of the Gospels, he will not be tempted—or at any rate much tempted—to twist a passage for homiletical or doctrinal purposes. A yet further reason for pursuing the detailed study of the Gospels is that thereby positive results are achieved which are essential to clear thinking and sound faith.

The first result of critical study often appears negative, and an instinctive resentment against 'the surgery of criticism' is evoked. Such is sometimes felt, for example, when textual criticism is found to refuse the doxology of Mt 6<sup>13</sup> as a part of the Lord's Prayer, or when literary criticism is found to refuse the claim of independence made for, say, the first or third Evangelist (a claim demanded by older views of inspiration). Readjustment in face of such critical conclusions is often painful, and arouses fear that what has proved deeply satisfying in past religious experience, in general, will be lost.

But new insights call for adjustment; and adjustment, honestly made, is an intellectual release from error or limitation and a spiritual approach to God. As F. J. A. Hort said, 'In respect of the Bible especially, it remains true that whatever helps our understanding helps also in the long run our praying and our working.'

The technical scholar can help to bridge the gap between research and pastorate, and so to do something in the cause of an adequate ministry. One way in which he can bridge that gap is by participating in the practical work of the minister in his preaching, teaching, and pastoral activities. The New Testament writings are all practical in intent, and contact with the practical phases of a minister's work promotes a deeper and truer understanding of the 'key documents' of Christianity.

Another obligation resting upon scholars is that of working toward the largest possible agreement among themselves. Exchange of views and mutual criticism is a constant task of scholarship. If this task were to be more diligently pursued, the minister would not have so long to wait in order to observe the reaction of other scholars to some promising or provocative book.

It cannot be gainsaid that the moral confusion of our age is extreme. Morality is now attacked at its very roots. The question now is, not of how to conform to an acknowledged standard of conduct, but whether there is any such standard at all.

In this connexion the present unrest and dire distress among the nations is profoundly significant to the moralist. Plato says somewhere that if we are too short-sighted to discern the truth about human life on the small scale of the individual, we have only to look at the community or nation and we shall see the same truth written in large letters. That is confirmed by what we see in the world to-day. It cannot be without deep moral meaning that in an age when men have played fast and loose with moral standards, the affairs of the world have got into a desperate state as the result of human sin.

Christian moralists have to take account of the present moral confusion and begin to build from the very foundation. No longer can they take for granted that the Christian moral standard is universally accepted. Probably it really is accepted in the deep and secret places of most men's hearts, as they

would be bound to acknowledge if they were honest with themselves. Hence an appeal can yet be made to the still small voice within. But there is also something in the heart which objects to the commands and restraints of God's holy law, and which will therefore eagerly welcome anything which will support or justify rebellion.

In the task of relaying the foundations of a moral system the preacher will find helpful suggestions in a recent book, *Right and Wrong*, by the Rev. William P. KING, D.D. It treats first of 'the factors that obscure the distinction between right and wrong,' and secondly, of 'determinative tests by which we may know right and wrong.' It illustrates, without expressly dwelling upon the fact, how far man is from being a purely intellectual or rational being. The old idea that reason sits in the seat of judgment ready to pronounce impartially upon the evidence is entirely fanciful. Man's thinking is wishful thinking. The scale is turned, not by the weight of the evidence, but by the strength of the desires and passions which tip the beam. The distinction, therefore, which the sceptic is so fond of making between faith as credulity and unbelief as impartiality has no foundation in fact. The will rather than the intellect is ultimately the decisive factor in determining both belief and unbelief.

If we may not appeal to any divine or authoritative moral standard which will be universally acknowledged, we can still make our appeal to reason and experience as not dubiously indicating the right path. It is asserted that man should be free to follow his instincts as the lower animals follow theirs, that to repress desires may produce a complex harmful to life and health. In reply to this, the fact must be stressed that in man there is a continual conflict of desires, a conflict between what we have been wont to call his lower and his higher nature. 'The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh.' It is significant that when men bid us follow our desires it is the lower or animal desires which they have in view, and it is these same desires of the flesh which they tell us are so hurtful when repressed. Here is wishful thinking with a

vengeance. Plainly it is irrational and unscientific to ignore all the higher human desires and instincts. It is impossible to follow the desires of the flesh without repressing the desires of the spirit. Is there then nothing hurtful to well-being when a man represses his better instincts, his instinct to be clean and reverent and faithful and self-forgetful? Surely human personality must be taken as a whole, with its spiritual affinities as well as its lower instincts.

Another obvious consideration is that the conduct of the individual is to be judged by its effects upon the community. 'No man liveth to himself and no man dieth to himself.' Is the man who has tired of the marriage bond, and whose sensual instincts prompt him to another union, entitled to leave the wife and children whom he has made to be dependent on him? No social order could exist for a day if it allowed the individual to follow his instincts without restraint. Kant gave it as a moral test to consider what the consequences would be if everybody acted as I act. And doubtless that is a valid test, for none of us has a right to act as if he were alone in the world.

Then there is the time element to be considered. It takes time for the fruits of conduct to appear. You sow the seed to-day but the result of your sowing will not appear until the harvest. Life is to be viewed and judged as a whole, and any line of conduct which simply grasps at the bubble of present pleasure without regard for permanent well-being stands self-condemned.

Further, there is a wealth of moral guidance to be derived from the accumulated experience of the human race. We are richer by the fact that the generations who have gone before us have been experimenting for thousands of years and have found out, often at bitter cost, many things which are helpful or harmful. It would be the height of madness to despise or cast away this wealth of experience. For the most part we gratefully accept it. Nobody proceeds to taste all fruits and herbs to discover for himself which are wholesome and which are poisonous. Nobody puts his hand into the fire to see if it will be burnt: nobody throws

himself over a precipice to test the law of gravitation. Yet to-day there are those who think it clever to play with fire, who despise the wisdom of the past and assert their independence, saying, 'Why may I not try it out for myself?' They need to be warned that some experiments are too dangerous to be tried out.

Of course we may err at the one extreme by too blindly accepting the traditions of the past without testing them for ourselves. But that is not the danger that besets this age of ours. Manifestly the danger for us is that we fly to the opposite extreme and count nothing to be fixed and settled. The truth, however, is that some things have been settled beyond peradventure. The moral experience of the generations of the human race has not all been in vain. Every possible line of conduct has been tried out, times without number, and out of myriad experiments certain truths have emerged. A consensus of opinion has been arrived at which no man should lightly despise, indicating that there are ways which lead to life and health, and contrariwise there are ways which lead to loss and ruin.

In general, without falling back upon revelation or any divine authority, we may confidently say that the moral law stands the pragmatic test. It may be said of moral systems, as of individuals, that 'by their fruits ye shall know them.' Judged by this test the 'good life' as Christians understand it can challenge comparison with any other scheme of conduct. It brings in an ever-increasing degree of satisfaction and rest of heart such as no other way of life can bring. When put to the proof it is self-authenticating. It is optimistic and invigorating, whereas the sensual life is debilitating and finally pessimistic. So obvious is this that it strongly suggests the conviction that the moral law rests on a divine sanction and is in harmony with the order of the universe. He, therefore, who sets himself against it, however he may seem for a time to prosper, cannot in the end succeed, for he is fighting against God.

The Twenty-fifth Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen was held at Loughborough College,

Leicestershire, in September. Its theme was 'Modern Christian Education,' and the papers read at the Conference are published in the October number of *The Modern Churchman*. The programme covered most aspects of the subject, and there was in many of the papers an evident sense of the urgency of the problems involved. As interesting as any of the contributions was the address by Sir Cyril NORWOOD, President of St. John's College, Oxford, and President of the Modern Churchmen's Union, on 'The Christian Teacher and the Modern World.'

The President began by saying what needs to be said with great emphasis, that only by Christian education can the modern world be saved from an abyss of which no man can see the bottom. The danger is created by our increasing command of enormous material forces, and the coincident decline in our moral standards. We are driving a vehicle of high power, the brakes of which are not working well, and the steering-wheel is defective. In these circumstances there can be no subject of graver importance than that of Christian education.

In dealing with his own aspect of it—'The Christian Teacher and the Modern World'—the President raised first the question: What is the Christian teacher? There are so many kinds of Christians in the world, and so many kinds of Christianity, some of which so overlay the original figure of the Founder that it is hard to see Him at all. Men and women are turning away from conventional presentations of Christianity which seem to be irrelevant to the needs of the modern world. How much does the ordinary man believe to-day? When Tennyson was asked what he believed he said: 'I believe in God, and I believe that my personality endures. That is my faith, and that is all my faith.' It is doubtful whether the ordinary man to-day would do more than affirm the first part of that declaration.

But take that affirmation, that God is, and let us ask what Christianity has to teach us about *what* God is. Well, said Sir Cyril, as I see it, Christianity teaches us that God is good and wishes us to be good. Further, that God is truth, and all truth, all knowledge is in accordance with His will.

Further still, that God is in all beauty, and revealed in all beauty. And once more, and this is the specifically Christian thing, God is love. In the words of Dr. Barnes: 'God's universe is shot through and through with goodness that shall in the end triumph. In Christ we see goodness triumphing over pain and evil. By this triumph we are led on to the certainty that His example and His gospel, if men would only accept them, would bring the world to God: and therein, for me, is the Incarnation.'

That, then, is the Christian teacher: one who believes and is prepared to teach these things. And the modern world in which his teaching is to be given? The President warns us against painting it too black. But his own colour is pretty sombre. There are certain things, he said, in the modern world which constitute a threat to Christianity. Perhaps the strongest threat comes from Totalitarianism in all its forms. True: it has conferred great benefits in every country where it prevails. But at a great price, at the cost of freedom of the value of the individual, whose duty to the State is absolute self-surrender. This is fundamentally at issue with Christianity, for to the Christian the State exists for the individual, and as individuals we are the sons of God and heirs of eternal life. This is familiar ground and need not be further explored. But Sir Cyril NORWOOD is certain that there is far more Totalitarianism in our own country than we think. For Materialism is rampant, and materialists (whether in the right or the left) have no use for freedom in other people.

A serious position from the point of view of the Church is revealed in the indifference of the mass of the laity to its institutional life. It is not a pleasant task to find fault with the Church, said Sir Cyril. But there is little good in burying one's head in the sand, and there are criticisms of the Church widely prevalent and widely believed which are not without foundation.

There is—to take one—a decline in the quantity and quality of ordinands, and nearly half of them lack a university degree of any sort. A field of this

kind is not a good soil for producing leadership. The interests of a large number of the clergy to-day are quite foreign to those of the laity. Congregations are said to be not more than a quarter of what they were before the War, and young people drift rapidly away from institutional Christianity as soon as they reach the years of indiscretion. The clergy as a whole overestimate sacramentalism, ritual, and dogma, and they underestimate learning, culture, and example. They are suspected as obscurantists and rightly deprived of leadership, because the idea of a faith once for all delivered in a remote period of past time runs counter to every instinct of the modern mind. All this is said reluctantly and is subject to modification in two respects. It is too sweeping, and it leaves out the shining examples of clergy who are real scholars and leaders. 'But taking the whole indictment into consideration, if I were on a Grand Jury I should return a True Bill.'

There is another thing in our modern world which may be considered evil or partly evil. 'If I were asked to describe what most differentiates the present time from the period in which I grew up, say the nineties of last century, I should not dwell first on the wonders of wireless communication and all the miracles of applied science which we enjoy, but the presence of fear now, when it was absent then. That fear may be conscious, it may be subconscious, in the mind of the individual, but it is there.' About the eternal future we may not know, but we do know that forces we cannot control may reduce our life's savings to nothing, may reduce the cities we have built to ashes, may poison the air we breathe, or blow all to fragments. In what should be a period of profound peace and profitable labour we arm ourselves to the teeth, and prepare like moles our burrows underground. I take this comfort from the present need and distress of the peoples, that once before Christianity cast out fear from the world, and if its spirit can be recaptured the same gift which it brought before of love, joy, and peace may return.

Considering all this, Sir Cyril is certain that the main battle is to be fought in the ordinary schools of the country. He believes that the right policy of the Church is to hand over all its

schools to the State, and to concentrate all its efforts on the training of teachers, so that there will enter the educational services a steady supply of teachers who will come to their work not as a drudgery but as a vocation, as a means of bringing the children to God. He laid great stress on the fact that it is between the ages of twelve and sixteen that young people can receive a stamp that will not lightly be effaced. These are the dangerous years but also the hopeful years. And on these years the Church should concentrate its efforts.

It is a great task to which these teachers will be called. At present many profess their incapacity when asked to teach Scripture. In most cases it is a perfectly honest sense of inability. But with proper training this should disappear. 'Experience has led me to believe that a determined effort must be made to recover the knowledge of the Bible which formerly existed, and the influence for good which it exerted in the national life.' But it was never more possible to do this, thanks to scholarship and a gradually broadening view of what revelation means and how it has come. But there are questions and problems raised, and raised just at the age of adolescence, to which reference has been made, which require competence on the part of the teacher to deal with. And for this there is needed a class of specialist teachers who have had special and thorough training. And here the Church could help the great cause of national education by providing such specialists.

It is not by one expedient or another, however, that the Christian teacher will convert the modern world. The greatest need is a new dedication by the teacher of himself to the task of training the youth of our land for true and worthy living. This spirit, the conception of a school life dedicated to spiritual values, is alive in the schools to-day, and is becoming commoner. There are many teachers who are dissatisfied with humanism and realize its impotence in face of the perilous problems of modern life. And there is reason to hope that this is an attitude that is spreading in the educational world. And so there is no need for pessimism. The modern world has much in it that is sound and healthy. And the Kingdom of God lies always in the future.



# The World=View of the Bible and the World=View of To-day.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND A. E. J. RAWLINSON, D.D., BISHOP OF DERBY.

I WAS asked, when I undertook to deliver this lecture, to try to say something which might help teachers in Secondary Schools in their teaching of Scripture. I believe that I can best help them by attempting to look at the matter quite broadly. With details I shall not greatly concern myself. What I shall try to do is to suggest primarily a point of view. The teaching of the Bible in modern Secondary Schools is beyond question an exceedingly difficult task. Those who are to discharge it adequately will need, of course, to acquire a good deal of what may be described as special or technical knowledge. But they will need also, beyond this, to bring to bear upon their teaching the whole range of their intellectual and spiritual capacity. The task is indeed one which can only be rightly approached in a spirit of genuine self-dedication, and upon the basis of personal prayer. A teacher needs to be a Christian, if he or she is to teach Christianity.

It is necessary to take for granted some kind of assumptions; and I propose to assume that the teachers with whom I am concerned are aware that we are living in a post-critical age, and that their pupils, as they approach manhood and womanhood, will be in contact with distinctively modern problems. The faith of the generation which is to-day being educated in Secondary Schools is not destined to be comfortably rooted in tradition. If it survives (and, given the right atmosphere, there is no reason why it should not survive), it will do so as a faith which has been passed through the modern crucible. It may indeed have to be built up from the beginning on critical lines. It cannot be taken for granted that the majority of boys and girls in our schools will have brought with them from home, or from Sunday School, an initial acquaintance with the Bible, based perhaps upon what would to-day be described as 'old-fashioned' principles. On the contrary, of a considerable proportion it would probably be truer to say that they bring with them no knowledge of the Bible at all. It is of vital importance, in either case, that the teaching which they receive in the schools

should be of first-rate quality, and that the Bible should be so presented to them that they may have nothing, at a later stage, to unlearn.

The amount of modern scientific work which has been done upon the Bible is almost bewildering in its extent. It is only necessary to think of the work of the archaeologists, pursuing their researches in Palestine and throughout the Semitic East; or again, of the comparative study of folk-lore, mythology, and religious cult; of the study of languages—Babylonian, Hebrew, Syriac, Egyptian, and Greek; of the intensively critical handling of ancient historical sources, and of the resolute attempts which have been made at a scientific reconstruction of ancient history. Textual criticism, source criticism, historical criticism, form criticism—the number and range of the different branches of learning which may be held to be involved in the scientific study of the Bible continually grows. The plain man may indeed be tempted to declare himself baffled.

And certainly the plain man cannot himself be a specialist. On the other hand, the understanding of the Bible cannot safely be left to the specialists. The work of the specialists can sometimes degenerate into pedantry, and there are specialists who do not succeed in discriminating the wood from the trees. But the work of the specialists lies behind the works of the best modern commentators; and it ought to be possible for the ordinary educated person—that is to say, for the ordinary teacher—to have become familiar with the contents of at least a few skilfully chosen modern books of first-rate quality, in which the results of the specialists' labours are made available, without pedantry, for the illumination of the ordinary educated mind. The teacher must certainly be familiar with the accepted methods and with the broad results of modern historico-critical work on the Bible. They can be found summarized in any reasonably good modern handbook, and the modern approach to the Bible depends on them.

But the modern approach—and, quite certainly, any kind of *religious* approach to the Bible—must inevitably go beyond any mere questions of what would be ordinarily meant by the term 'criticism.' It is after (and not before) the main critical questions

<sup>1</sup> Delivered at Liverpool as the 'Liverpool Lecture' under the auspices of the Liverpool Joint Board of Divinity, 12th October 1938.

with regard to the Bible have been asked and answered that the real issues begin to emerge. Let it be granted that the effort has been resolutely made, with the help of all the resources of modern learning, to understand Hebrew and early Christian religious history in relation to their respective historical contexts; that the mind has been shaken thoroughly free from the presuppositions alike of mere literalism and of conservatism; that dates, authorships, documents, sources, and periods have (with such varying degrees of probability and of assurance as may be attainable) been duly arranged and discriminated; and that the whole fascinating corpus of Biblical literature has, as a consequence of all this, in a quite new way come to life. The question still remains, What is to be made of it all? What is its message for our time? In what sense is it true to say that the Scriptures were 'written for our learning'? Until *these* questions begin to be raised, the study of the Bible remains in principle secular.

Now, it is, of course, possible to treat the Bible as though it consisted simply of a body of secular literature; and I have indeed indicated that, for certain preliminary and scientific purposes, it must, in a sense, be so treated. The Old Testament, considered from this point of view, is a book which may be said to contain history—though it is a traditional and not specially accurate history. It contains a succession of codifications and stratifications of Hebrew law—though it was a law which, throughout its successive developments, was put forward in the peculiar form of a religious commandment or 'teaching,' believed to have been given to Israel, through Moses, from God. It contains a good deal of poetry, a good deal of mythology and folk-lore, a good deal of proverbial and homely wisdom. It contains also traditions about the beginnings of things—the beginnings of the Hebrew or Israelite people, the beginnings of the human race as a whole, the beginning of the world itself, considered as the creation of God. It contains prophetic writings of a variety of periods and types, and (in the Book of Daniel) an example of the class of literature known as apocalyptic—the setting forth, usually in the form of imagined visions, purporting to have been seen by one of the men of old time, of a symbolical view of the spiritual issues of history, and of the coming of an expected End. The New Testament, considered from the same point of view, contains a number of letters, both actual letters, addressed to their converts by missionaries, and also open letters (in one or two cases very likely pseudonymous) addressed to the

Christian Church as a whole. It contains at least one very complete and elaborate apocalypse. It contains a contribution to Early Church history: and it contains also the four short books known as 'Gospels,' in which there is set forth (though from a somewhat peculiar point of view, and with what the secular historian would regard as a disproportionate emphasis upon the remembered stories of the Saviour's Passion and Resurrection) so much as the Church cared to preserve of the teaching and life upon earth of the Person who, in the New Testament itself, is regarded as having been, on the spiritual plane, the fulfilment of all the prophetic hopes of the Old Covenant, and the final 'Word' or self-revelation of God to mankind.

I have found it difficult, in the last half sentence, to avoid using the kind of phraseology which is native to Christian faith. The fact of this difficulty may perhaps serve to illustrate the point that the Bible (however for our purposes it may at a certain stage be convenient to treat it as though it were secular) is in actual fact, as of course we all recognize, not a secular book. It is a Book which speaks to us of God. It presents to us, at every stage, a religious challenge. Its writers do not merely disclose or express *themselves* in their writings. Implicitly or explicitly, they convey—or they claim to convey—a 'Word' or message from God. Certainly it has been the claim of the Christian Church (and it is a claim spiritually vindicated in the experience of large numbers of human lives) that the Bible mediates or conveys to us a Divine 'Word,' and that God, by the activity of His Spirit, speaks to the souls of men through the Biblical writings. If this be so, then the question which we ought to ask of ourselves finally, with regard to each of the books of the Bible, and indeed with regard to each passage or section of Scripture, when we have done our very best, with the aid of such secular learning as we may possess, to understand it, is the question: What is God's message or 'Word' to us, here in the twentieth century, uttered through and by means of these ancient writings or 'words,' which come down to us out of the past, and which speak to us in the language of so long ago?

For the Bible does come down to us out of the past. It is ancient, and not modern: and its *point of view* is not modern. It is ancient, Semitic, Oriental, to a large extent mythological, naïvely supernaturalist, pre-scientific, and popular. Its whole mentality stands in the sharpest contrast with that of the modern educated, rationalistic and scientifically-trained mind. I believe it to be

of the utmost importance that we should be deliberately aware of this contrast, and that we should not in any way attempt to water it down, or to slur it over, or to explain it away. The two points of view—the two world-outlooks—are not to be ‘reconciled,’ for they are essentially different. They should be held together in contrast. The Biblical point of view, which is essentially non-scientific, is not to be ‘modernized.’ When we ask, for example, what precisely, in the way of what the modern world would call ‘scientific fact,’ underlies the Biblical stories of ‘miracle,’ the true answer is always ‘We do not know.’ But the miracle-stories, though they cannot be rationalized, and though the modern mind may be sceptical and puzzled as to ‘what actually happened,’ constitute in their context an essential element in the whole Biblical view of the world (which in the last resort is a drama of human redemption); and the modern view of the world-order, valid no doubt from its own point of view and for scientific purposes, needs to allow itself to be challenged, as to its final adequacy, by the contrasted Biblical world-outlook, which (albeit in the language of ‘men of strange lips and with another tongue’) yet claims to speak to us an ultimate ‘Word’ from the living God as to the final meaning of life and of human destiny under the sovereignty of God.

Let me attempt to sketch briefly, and to set before you, what I have described as the ‘Biblical’ view of the world. It begins with God, to whose creative activity the existence of the world itself is ascribed. ‘In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.’ That is a statement which is mythological in form. It cannot completely be rationalized, if only for the reason that it appears to contain the idea of an absolute beginning. Yet it expresses a truth with regard to the relation of God to the world which perhaps cannot be expressed adequately in any less mythological way. The world begins, then, with God: and God creates it and sees that it is good. And then evil enters into the world. The idea of the Fall is another piece of mythology. The story of Adam and Eve in the Garden conveys no chronicle of any actual events which at any particular time may be supposed to have taken place on the earth. It expresses the idea of the entry of evil into the world, though without explaining it; and it denies by implication any such idea as that God Himself could be the immediately responsible Author of sin. The world, then, is a fallen world: nevertheless God is continually at work. Man has his projects and purposes, all of them in varying degree

tainted or infected [by sin]. God overrules, turns or deflects them, utilizes them in the interests of His own wider purposes, or (in particular instances) simply defeats them and brings them to nought. Throughout the Biblical story, the supernatural factor is freely brought in. Miracles may at any moment occur. There is a continuing converse of heaven with earth. God does His ‘strange work’ among men, and He is Himself the supreme Actor in history, from time to time ‘revealing His secret,’ by way of commentary, ‘unto His servants the prophets.’

The course of world-history, meanwhile, is an essentially religious and moral drama. God takes sides, and the side of God is the side of righteousness. But the righteousness of God, in the Bible, is not an impartial or abstract righteousness. God is on the side of righteousness, but He is also on the side of His people. Among all the races and nations of mankind, He has made choice of a particular folk, the ‘seed’ or descendants of the Semitic *sheikh*, Abraham; and His Divine ‘righteousness’ is regarded as being very specifically exhibited in the fact that He remains faithful to His Covenant. His people Israel are regarded as being in no way worthy of His choice, for they persistently show themselves to be rebellious, idolatrous, ‘impudent and stout-hearted,’ sinful, ‘laden with iniquity’; but God refuses to give them up. As against other nations, He normally champions their cause. Alternatively, He uses disaster as discipline; He ‘brings evil’ upon His people, as a drastic punishment for their manifold sins. He pours out upon them the vials of His Divine ‘wrath.’ They are purged drastically, so that only a ‘remnant’ remains.

But the ultimate aim is a restoration; and in the Judaism of post-exilic times—that is to say, the Judaism which canonized the Old Testament, and from which its later books emanate—we are presented with the spectacle of a Church-nation, wholly given over, in principle, to the pursuit of religion, subjected to the ‘yoke’ of the Law, cherishing the ‘hope’ and the ‘promise’ of a coming deliverance, in theory *deseccularized* (that is to say, in principle, taken out of, or removed from, the sphere of things mundane and secular), and having their heart and their interests essentially rooted not in this present world, not in this present evil ‘age,’ but in God.

There was a conflict, here as elsewhere, between the ideal and the actual. The story of Judaism is a chequered one. No actual nation has ever consisted wholly of ‘saints’; and there were still ‘sinners’

in Israel, side by side with the 'righteous.' The specifically religious party in Judaism, at least in the post-Maccabean period, was that of the Pharisees; and, despite the justified protests of Jewish scholars that the Pharisees of history have been largely misjudged, the Pharisees undoubtedly showed themselves liable to the kind of besetting temptations and failures which gave rise to the tremendous denunciations of Pharisaism in the Gospels. Nevertheless, Judaism did stand for a zeal for God—a zeal motivated by obedience and hope; and the ideal hope upon which the heart of Judaism, in its best moments, was set was in last resort (however, upon the surface of things, it may have appeared as though the 'old fathers' did look for 'transitory promises') no merely political, earthly, or 'this-world' programme, but the final end of this present 'age,' and—by contrast—the glory of God and of His people.

*Novum testamentum in vetere latet, vetus testamentum in novo patet*—the New Testament lies hidden in the Old Testament, the Old Testament finds its true meaning and fulfilment in the New. It is of the Old Testament that I have thus far been speaking: the New Testament stands in essential relation thereto. The ideal of the holy people of God is made new in Christ, who is at once the Redeemer and the ideal Representative of the true Israel; and at once, in the New Testament, the new, redeemed Israel 'after the Spirit' replaces the old unredeemed Israel 'after the flesh.' The 'promises' of God find on the spiritual plane their fulfilment—though it was after a paradoxical fashion, which to the majority of contemporary Jews proved a 'stumbling-block,' and which to the majority of contemporary Gentiles appeared 'foolishness.' Surprisingly, the expected 'Age' of the Messiah had arrived; and there was a new 'Covenant' made in His 'blood'—that is to say, in His life-blood, consecrated, offered in sacrifice, shed sacrificially in death, on behalf of the people of God. The true or ideal 'Israel of God' is thereby brought into being, and (unlike the old, literal Israel) it is discovered to be, in scope and in principle, universal. What has been described as 'the hope of Catholic Judaism' has thus, in an unexpected way, begun to be realized.

Meanwhile, the demands of the Divine holiness, the austere standards of an ideal or absolute 'righteousness,' required of all such as would be heirs of the Divine 'Kingdom,' have not been relaxed. They have, on the contrary, become intensified. The Sermon on the Mount, taken seriously, stands for an ideal not less, but more,

searching than that of the Old Testament law. The verdict of the Old Covenant, even upon the best and noblest of human beings, was to the effect that 'all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.' The Sermon on the Mount, with its intensified and more penetrating standard, constrains the most Christlike of Christians to acknowledge himself a sinner in need of God's mercy.

But the New Testament, fulfilling and going beyond Judaism, proclaims to sinners in need of God's mercy the glad, free message of God's salvation. Despite the fact that the demands of the Divine Righteousness have become not less, but more, penetrating, there is set forth, in mysterious fashion, the free, liberating, evangelical 'Word' of forgiveness and mercy—a message not simply of 'forgiveness to those who repent, but of repentance to those who sin.' The life-offering of Christ, sealed and completed in death, and triumphant through resurrection and victory, becomes the starting-point of a new era. Interpreted as a supreme act of Divine self-sacrifice, whereby (in the Person of One who is Himself the 'express image' of the Divine Being or 'substance,' incarnate in manhood) God in mysterious fashion grapples victoriously with the powers of sin, death, and evil, and at the cost of suffering and tragedy proves Himself conqueror, the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ are in the New Testament set forth as the beginning of a new hope for mankind. The new 'Age,' or the New Era, has dawned. Those who are 'in Christ' have already 'tasted the powers of the Age to Come.' There is for them 'no condemnation.' They have been forgiven, washed, cleansed, sanctified, reconciled to God in Christ Jesus. They have received the free gift of a renewed and restored Divine Sonship. There has been a 'new creation,' a bringing of 'life and immortality to light through the gospel,' a re-making of human nature. There has been bestowed upon believers, as the result of an imparted 'gift' of the Divine Spirit from on high, the power from henceforth to 'walk in the Spirit,' so as no longer to 'fulfil the lust of the flesh.'

Meanwhile, the Church looks still for a Divine 'Coming'—the return of the glorified Saviour to judgment, the 'new earth' and the 'new heavens.' Already it is the 'last time.' The 'darkness is past, the true light now shines.' 'The time is at hand.' The world 'hasteth to pass away.' There is, for modern thinking, a formidable difficulty here. The spiritual value, it may be suggested, of all this kind of language is best grasped when it is interpreted, not as a quasi-literal description of a

future event, a kind of literal 'Last Day,' but as a parable of the continuous and permanent relation of the perpetually imminent eternal order to the process of events in time, a kind of symbolic picture of the ultimate issues of human life and of spiritual destiny. However this may be, the Church holds fast, as to a permanent truth, to the conviction that human life, here and now, stands in immediate relation to the Judgment, the Kingdom of God, Heaven and Hell, and the Life of the World to Come. Strong in their new-found faith, and with a sense of urgency intensified by the conviction that the time, in a literal sense, was indeed short, the first Apostles of Christianity set themselves, in the power of the Spirit, to proclaim their new message, and already, even in the course of the brief period represented by the New Testament writings, they were in process of 'turning the world,' in a spiritual sense, 'upside down.'

I have done my best to put things succinctly. I have had to compress, and I am conscious of much that has perforce been omitted. But I have tried to put before you, in broad outline, the Biblical outlook. It presents difficulties to the mind. But unless the Bible (and more particularly the New Testament) is so taught as to set forth this kind of message, it is quite clear that its whole point has been missed. And yet all the time there persists the sharp challenge and contrast (to which I have already referred) between the mentality and world-view of the Biblical writers, and the radically different world-view of the modern scientifically-trained mind. The point of view of the Bible, as I have said, is pre-scientific, supernaturalistic, and popular. It is from first to last consciously and deliberately theistic. It claims to be the vehicle, medium, and literary deposit of a revelation from God. It presents to the modern mind a peculiar and special challenge, in that it treats a particular course of history, culminating in the events underlying the Gospel tradition (events which, according to Christian faith, are to be interpreted in terms of the supra-historical dogma of the Incarnation, Passion, and Resurrection, on behalf of us men and 'for our salvation,' of the eternal and co-essential Son of God), as containing within itself the supreme clue to the meaning of all history, and to the spiritual destiny of man. '*The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory)*'—that is at once the supreme affirmation, the paradox, and the offence of the Christian gospel.

For the modern mind does find these things difficult. The achievements of Natural Science and the habit of critical approach to the problems of

history have brought it about that the educated mind of to-day is, to a large extent, dominated by the ideas of an unchanging world order and of the operation of natural law. Within the frame-work and general scheme of such a world-order the course of history unrolls itself; and the modern mind seeks to interpret history in such terms as it can. Economic, social, and political factors are clearly discerned as being at work; and the influence of human ambitions, ideals, aspirations, and purposes may in varying degree be acknowledged also. There are diversities of schools among modern historical interpreters, variations which no doubt in the last resort are determined by ultimate differences of philosophical world-outlook as between this writer and that. But the presuppositions of all tend to be naturalistic. The modern historian does not readily invoke the idea of the supernatural. The occurrence of a miracle he would find frankly disturbing. Events of that character—so, in the majority of cases, he is persuaded—do not happen. To interpret historical processes in terms of such ideas as those of the intervention or of the direct action of God would appear to the typically modern historian to be the negation of the ideal, as he has come to understand it, of a truly objective and scientific history.

But the Bible confronts the modern mind with its challenge. It directly raises the question of God. It suggests to men that they are in danger of losing life in the mere business of living, and of losing the true wisdom in the accumulation of mere pieces of knowledge. It speaks of life and of death, of sin and of judgment, of the transitoriness of this present world, and of the possibility of an answer, in terms of the life eternal, to the obstinate questionings of the human spirit, subconsciously athirst, in the midst of all its false pride of achievement, for the living God, who has too long been left out of the picture, and who, if He speak to mankind, must speak in judgment, no less than in mercy. Judgment and mercy, sin and forgiveness, life and death, time and eternity—it is with these fundamental themes that the Biblical world-view is concerned: with these, and with the ultimate world-purpose of God, described, in a New Testament phrase, as the summing-up of 'all things in Christ,' by whose Passion and Victory the powers of evil and death have been conquered, and by the 'blood' of whose sacrifice an estranged universe has been won back to God. The world may retort that sin, evil, and death still continue. The Christian admits that 'we see not yet all things put under him. But' (he adds) 'we see Jesus, who was

made a little lower than the angels, because of the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour'; and he believes that it shall yet one day be made plain that His 'tasting' of death was 'on every man's behalf.'

The conclusions of faith are not such as to force themselves on the mind, leaving no option for man to reject them. The alternative of a final scepticism (which in my judgment involves as its corollary an ultimate world-pessimism) remains permanently open. But I would submit to you that it was not without reason that an American scholar was led some years ago to sum up the results of a learned research into the New Testament by asking himself and his readers the question: 'If there be any true myth, if the Divine nature has at any time in any wise revealed itself to man, if any voice shall ever reach us out of the infinite circle of silence, where else shall we look but to the words of the Gospel?'

The teacher of Scripture, whether in a Secondary School or elsewhere, cannot constrain or compel the belief of his pupils; and he must certainly not shirk intellectual questions. On the contrary, let him be, in his presentation and in his exposition of the Biblical material, as objectively and scientifically critical as his best efforts may enable him to be. But he will not have done his work properly unless he has succeeded in bringing his pupils' minds sharply up (when the last word has been said by historical criticism) against the authentic spiritual challenge of the Scriptures in their religious aspect, as mediating the Word of God. And 'the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart.'

---

## Great Texts Reconsidered.

BY THE REVEREND W. F. HOWARD, D.D., OF THE LAMPLOUGH CHAIR OF NEW TESTAMENT  
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, HANDSWORTH THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM.

'For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'—Mk 10<sup>45</sup> (R.V.).

THIS text has suffered grievously at the hands of expositors and of critics. A rigorous interpretation of the word 'ransom' has strained a metaphor beyond all reasonable limits, whilst in the other direction a recoil from supposed Pauline theology has denied to these words any authenticity as a saying of our Lord. At this time of day it is hardly necessary to consider the unhappy theory associated with the names of Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, according to which the ransom was paid to the devil. Anselm slew that monstrosity long ago. But those who regarded the ransom as paid to God and not to the devil only too often elaborated theories which were as fantastic as they were unethical. The pendulum has now swung so far in the other direction that modern exposition is rather in danger of reducing the legion to a pious platitude.

For a generation past it has been almost an axiom of critical opinion that the second half of the verse, at any rate, must be dismissed as the reflection of

the theologically-minded Church upon the simple ethical teaching of Jesus. This suggestion was first made, I believe, by F. C. Baur. Its most plausible statement for English readers is probably that supplied by Hastings Rashdall in his Bampton Lectures, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*. The case against the authenticity has never been put more ably than by that fine critic and exegete, Johannes Weiss. After expounding the saying from the point of view of the primitive Church, and of Mark and his readers, he asks in what sense it can be regarded as a word of Jesus Himself. 'More recent criticism is convinced that Jesus could not have spoken in this way. For (a) The whole life and work of the Lord is here viewed in retrospect (He "came"). (b) The word "ransom," and the entire series of ideas suggested by it, occurs nowhere else in the preaching of Jesus. (c) The parallel saying from Q ("I am in the midst of you as he that serveth," Lk 22<sup>27</sup>), says nothing about a redemptive death, and is surely the original form of the utterance.' Weiss goes on to say that this conception of the work of Jesus as a service to those

whom He had gathered round Him harmonizes so completely with His whole way of life that we should describe His life-work in this fashion, even if we had not this Lucan record of the logion. 'Now of course it is not completely unthinkable that Jesus should have included His imminent death in the work of service and love, and further that His death would benefit the men whom He was winning by word and deed. But whether He thought exactly of a sacrificial death, or of vicarious penal suffering, as Is 53 (according to later interpretation) described it, is still open to doubt. We men of the present age may be thankful, since the thought of an expiatory sacrifice presents many difficulties, that we can be satisfied with the idea that His death, no less than His whole life, was a true service for His brethren.' (*Die Schriften des N.T.*, 3rd ed., i. 174f.). Again, when dealing with the closely related words in Mk 14<sup>24</sup>, 'This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many,' Johannes Weiss comments on the absence in the shorter and more original Lucan text (Lk 22<sup>14-19a</sup>) of any connexion between the cup and the blood of Christ, and so of any reference in the Supper to the sacrificial death of the Lord. In the same way the eucharistic prayers in the *Didache* have not a single word alluding to the death of Jesus (*ib.*, 203). The inference suggested is that in the Passion narrative Luke preserves an older Palestinian tradition, whereas the Marcan and Pauline tradition has been coloured by the ideas and usages of the Gentile Church.

In one of the most recent English commentaries on Mark, that by Professor B. H. Branscomb (in the *Moffatt N.T.C.*), the same line of treatment is followed. With regard to Mk 10<sup>45</sup> he says, 'The verse can hardly be attributed to Jesus . . . (It) must be explained as one of the instances of the influence of the Apostle Paul's thought on the 'Gospel.' Yet Dr. Branscomb is aware that this is not so certain as it once appeared to be, for he adds: 'Recent studies of this phase of the Gospel, however, have shown that this has often been overstated. Many of Paul's most characteristic ideas are absent from the Gospel, and some of those which are to be found do not completely represent his thought.' When dealing with the account of the Last Supper the same scholar makes an interesting attempt to account for the variant traditions, and decides that the words attributed to Jesus in Mk 14<sup>24</sup> are evidently the result of later reflection. But in the discussion of both of these closely related passages the commentator entirely overlooks the significant word 'many.' This is not Pauline. The form of this

logion in the circles influenced by Paul is clearly and most characteristically seen in 1 Ti 2<sup>6</sup>. 'Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all,' and in Tit 2<sup>14</sup> 'Christ Jesus, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity.'

The words 'for many,' which form so strong a link between Mk 10<sup>45</sup> and 14<sup>24</sup>, point back to the great song of the Suffering Servant, and any exegesis which fails to take this into account will almost certainly go astray. This is clearly recognized in many of the best modern commentaries, and in most of the recent studies of the subject. A wrong path was taken when, in recognizing the immense services of the Apostle Paul to early Christian thought, it came to be assumed that his was the creative mind which fashioned a new theology out of nothing. The more we study the primitive Christian tradition and the earliest Christian preaching the more we must acknowledge that the creative mind in the Church was that of Jesus Himself. Hints and indications given to His disciples were no doubt developed as questions arose which were not present to the minds of the first hearers of the Lord. But the outstanding assertion made by Jesus in the whole tenour of His teaching and example is that the Messiah must be interpreted in the light of the Servant of Jehovah.

The treatment of our text by such expositors as Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson (now Bishop of Derby) in the *Westminster Commentary* (1925), the late Professor C. H. Turner in the *Gore Commentary* (1928, St. Mark since reprinted separately), Professor Julius Schniewind in his excellent commentary on Mark and Matthew in *Das Neue Testament Deutsch* (1933 and 1937), and in such works of careful exposition as Otto's *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn* (1934, English Tr., *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, 1938) and Dr. Vincent Taylor's *Jesus and His Sacrifice* (1937), is based upon a recognition that the key to its understanding must be sought in Is 52<sup>13-53</sup><sup>12</sup>.

It is in the closing verses of that poignant song that we find 'the many' recurring as a refrain. The words are so familiar in the language of the A.V. and the R.V. that we may be allowed to give them in Dr. Peake's rendering (*The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament*, 59):

Righteous shall My Servant appear to many,  
Since he bears their iniquities;  
Therefore shall he inherit amongst the many,  
And with the strong he shall divide the spoil.  
Inasmuch as he poured out his soul unto death,  
And was numbered with the rebellious,  
Though he bore the sin of many,  
And interceded for the rebellious.

This is the last of the four songs of the Servant of Jehovah, of which the other three are found in Is 42<sup>1-4</sup>, 49<sup>1-6</sup> and 50<sup>4-9</sup>. It matters not whether the author of these four songs thought of the Servant as Israel, any more than it matters for our purpose whether we can trace the corporate conception of Messiahship in the Old Testament, or whether the term Son of Man is sometimes used in an inclusive sense. If, as seems certain beyond reasonable doubt, Jesus regarded Himself as Messiah and Son of Man, so also He took the description of the Servant as it is set forth in some of the most distinctive features of the portrait and reinterpreted the Messianic mission as a redemptive life of trustful obedience and suffering service.

'The Son of Man came not to be served but to serve.' There are three terms here which call for exposition.

(a) Son of Man was originally merely a synonym for Man, as may be seen from the parallelism of Ps 8<sup>4</sup>. But the word 'Man' was taken up into the esoteric vocabulary of the apocalyptic literature and used, not in a literal sense, but as a symbol for something else' (T. W. Manson, *Teaching of Jesus*, 212). In the second century B.C. we find this specialized use of the term in the Book of Daniel, where 'one like to a son of man' (7<sup>13</sup>), i.e. a human figure, is explained in vv. 18, 22 and 27 to represent 'the people of the saints of the Most High.' R. H. Charles writes upon this verse: 'How this passage gave rise subsequently to the Messianic designation can readily be understood from what precedes. The writer of the Parables of Enoch (1 Enoch xxxvii.-lxxi.) was the first student of Daniel vii., so far as existing literature goes, to interpret "onelike a son of man" in this passage as relating to an individual. The moment he did so, he rose to the conception of a superhuman Messiah, while following the natural method of interpreting the vision' ('Daniel,' in *Century Bible*, 78). There are fourteen passages in Mark in which this term is placed on the lips of Jesus. With the exception of 2<sup>10, 28</sup>, they all come after Christ's acceptance of Peter's acknowledgment of His Messiahship at Cæsarea Philippi. A comparison of parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels shows that sometimes 'Son of Man' means no more than simply 'I,' and in one or two passages it may mean no more than 'Man.' But that it could be used at all in our records is evidence that Jesus Himself used the circumlocution. 'Its use began in connexion with solemn words about the passion and delivery into men's hands. . . . This is how Jesus spoke of Himself. He knew Himself to be the one who had to suffer, not as an ordinary,

chance, private individual, nor as a mere martyr, but as the Son of Man. In other words, He knew Himself to be the Son of Man' (Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, 235).

(b) The word 'came,' when used by Jesus of Himself, seems to have two meanings. In such a passage as 'The Son of man came eating and drinking' the word simply stands for a way of living. But in such sayings as 'I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance,' and 'The Son of man came to seek and to save that which is lost,' there is a deeper meaning of a mission to be fulfilled. Thus in Mk 1<sup>38</sup>, 'Let us go elsewhere into the next town, that I may preach there also; for to this end came I forth,' many commentators take this to mean no more than His departure from Capernaum, but Luke took it in a deeper sense: 'I must preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God to the other cities also: for therefore was I sent' (Lk 4<sup>43</sup>). This is a link between the Synoptic Gospels and the Johannine phrase that recurs so often, 'He that sent me.'

(c) This mission of Jesus is 'to serve.' No doubt this carries with it the thought of humility, as the story of the foot-washing in Jn 13<sup>3-16</sup> reminds us, not least in the closing words: 'A servant is not greater than his lord; neither one that is sent greater than he that sent him.' But the special context of the Passion narrative—the forebodings with which Jesus started on that last journey to Jerusalem, and His repeated references to the doom that awaited Him there—compels us to recognize that a life-time of service is to find its climax in suffering and death for the sake of 'many.' The nature of this service in its ultimate form and deepest purpose is set forth in the words: 'And to give his life a ransom for many.'

The very least that these words can mean is that the suffering Son of Man lays down His life in a voluntary and vicarious surrender that others may live. The word translated 'ransom' (λύτρον), together with its cognates, is used nearly one hundred and forty times in the LXX, generally with the thought of the payment of compensation, or of deliverance from prison, or the offering of a substitute. It represents several different Hebrew words, some of which have deeper religious associations than others. The word does not occur in the Servant Songs, but the idea of vicarious suffering with an active purpose and result in the lives of others is prominent in Is 53.

But it was our sickness, that he bore, And our pains,  
he carried them . . .

But he was pierced through our rebellions, Crushed  
 through our sins,  
 The chastisement to win our peace was upon him,  
 And by his stripes was healing wrought for us.  
 We had all gone astray like sheep, We had turned  
 each his own way,  
 And Yahweh made to light on him The sin of us all.  
 And his fate who considered it,  
 That he was cut off out of the land of the living,  
 That for our rebellions he was smitten to death?<sup>1</sup>

These verses, no less than those already quoted, supply the background of the thought of our Lord upon His approaching death. The last of the Songs of the Servant 'is unique in the history of religion, and expresses an experience which is wholly irrational and not elucidated by any theory. A group of disciples experience atonement and sanctification in the humble voluntary suffering of their master in obedience to God' (Otto, *ib.*, 261). Whatever may have been the original reference, every verse in this poem becomes charged with a deeper meaning in the soul of Christ. He who came to proclaim the kingdom of God's grace felt as no other could ever do the awful meaning of man's sin in alienating him from the Father.

Desperate tides of the whole great world's anguish  
 Forced thro' the channels of a single heart.

The Servant is the physician who heals the sin-sick soul, but at the cost of His own suffering, so holy that a spiritual power is transmitted to the sinner. His self-surrender for the sake of those whose self-will has led them astray, far from fellowship with God, is to turn them to a new frame of mind, so that He may take from them their sin and thus restore them to the lost communion. Lastly, He acts as intercessor for the rebellious declaring the justice of the divine reaction against sin, yet at the same time maintaining the loving-kindness of God who delights to pardon. The Servant in fulfilling this mission of healing and reconciliation suffers an undeserved and shameful doom. He is discredited in the eyes of men. Yet God reverses this erroneous human judgment. 'My servant shall be exalted, He shall be lifted up and be very high.'

Is not this the key to the meaning of these words on the lips of Jesus? We need not look to them for some crude theory of substitutionary punishment,

<sup>1</sup> Peake, *Problem of Suffering*, 54 ff.; *The Servant of Yahweh*, 71.

nor to find levitical ideas developed in a doctrine of the Cross. It was natural for the Church of later days to bring all the symbolism of every part of the Old Testament to bear upon the elucidation of the central mystery of the Christian revelation. But the Gospels represent the figure of One who was conscious of a call and a mission to the highest service of God upon earth, whose path was one of unswerving obedience to the Father's will, who saw that the only Messiah that could meet the dire extremity of sinful human need was One who laid aside the majestic rôle of earthly conqueror and took upon Himself the form of the Servant of the Lord. From Caesarea Philippi onwards the disciples were to hear how remote their hopes of sovereignty were from the dread reality. Peter rebuked his Lord for such grim warnings. Then, as the last journey began, the startled disciples followed the solitary figure in silent awe, as He set His face like a flint towards the city of doom. When He breaks silence it is to repeat the warning of rejection, outrage, and death. At this moment two of His most intimate friends in the band of disciples attempt to steal a march on their fellows by bespeaking the foremost offices in the Messianic kingdom. When they are asked if they are prepared to share His cup and baptism of suffering they declare that they can meet the challenge. Then they are warned that not even martyrdom can secure what they desire. The disciple must follow in the Master's steps and choose the way of humble service. But this is not an abdication on His part. It is the way of victory. He will go alone to His doom. But His triumph will be shown in the many whom He will save by His death. The sublimest figure in ancient prophecy wrought reconciliation and carried away sin by submitting to the worst that could be inflicted on Him. In the same faith would the Son of Man meet the fury of the storm in that Jerusalem that had killed the prophets and stoned them that had been sent to her. His death would be no merely tragic event, but the inevitable climax of a life of sacrificial obedience to the divine will. Jesus did not explain this mystery. The rest of the New Testament records the way in which the Early Church proclaimed the Cross and sought to answer the questions which it provoked. But their answers are interpretations of the luminous hint which Jesus gave to His perplexed disciples in such sayings as Mk 10<sup>45</sup> and 14<sup>24</sup>.

## Literature.

### HUMANITARIANISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

*The Philanthropic Motive in Christianity*, by Frank M. Hnik, Ph.D., translated from the Czech by R. and M. Weatherall (Blackwell; 16s. net), has more adventitious interest than intrinsic importance. A translation from the Czech is a *rara avis* in English theological literature. The author belongs to, and in Part V. gives an account of, the Czechoslovak Church, a schism from the Roman Catholic Church, due partly at least to intensified patriotic feeling since 1919, as shown in its name, which in view of its numbers it is scarcely entitled to claim. For a time its theological position was uncertain; but as this book shows, it has not only abandoned Roman Catholic dogma and Papal domination, but is identifying itself with Unitarianism, or 'Free Christianity,' or Humanitarianism, the term which the author espouses. The heart-felt sympathy with Czechoslovakia that its present suffering is invoking will for many readers increase the interest. The inadequacy of the treatment of the subject deprives it, however, of the corresponding importance.

Christianity for the author is summed up in the truth of God's Fatherhood and man's brotherhood, and the duties of love to God and to man. These truths and these duties must be co-ordinated. To subordinate love to man to love to God is to make the philanthropic motive *theopathic*, defective, to co-ordinate is to make it *sociopathic*, effective. The impression throughout the book is that the author is making a theistic humanitarianism his standard of judgment. One passage, however, goes beyond this in affirming that, not only was this 'the good tidings of Jesus Christ,' but that the teaching is invested with significance and authority by the person. 'Jesus, therefore, looked upon His Messianic mission as a task entrusted by God, as a soteriological function that was the source of His Messianic self-confidence which is also recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus does not look upon Himself merely as a son of God along with other men but He emphasized the fact that His commission from God was of an exceptional, supreme, incommensurable character. The special nature of His sonship with respect to the Heavenly Father was pointed out by Jesus explicitly for example in Luke x. 22' (p. 45). The description of the theology as Unitarian, however, holds good.

From this standpoint the history of Christianity is reviewed. Part I. deals with the 'Ethics of the Beginnings of the Christian Religion'; in the Post-Apostolic Church there is a 'Resonance of the Gospel of Love'; but a decline has already begun in an increasing conformity to the world. In Part II., treating 'the Social Philosophy of Mediæval Catholicism,' 'the Submersion of the Kingdom of God in the Empirical Church' is described, a full account of the Social and Economic Theory of Thomas Aquinas is given, and the Roots and Fruit of Catholic Charity are judged: 'the letter of the law prevailed over the spirit of love' (p. 141). Part III. is concerned with 'the Social Philosophy of the Classical Reformation.' After indicating the inadequacy of Luther's social philosophy, and giving an account of the social consequences of the theological system of John Calvin, in which appreciation is blended with censure, the author expounds the views of E. Troeltsch, Max Weber, and G. Wünsch on the influence of Calvinistic Puritanism on Modern Capitalism, and correspondingly as Social Charity. These three parts contain a great deal of valuable material, and legitimate criticism, although the standard of judgment is too rigid.

From this point onward the inadequacy of the treatment becomes glaring. Part IV. expounds 'the Social Philosophy of Modern Humanitarianism,' as represented by W. E. Channing and Theodore Parker, and Part V. 'the Socially Theological Basis of Charity in the Czechoslovak Church.' Estimating as generously as we can the value of the contribution of the one and the other movement to the Philanthropy and the Social Service of the Christian Church, these two parts must appear as an anticlimax. Even if the author were justified in regarding Lutheranism and Calvinism as *static*, to ignore the contribution of the English-speaking nations in the 'orthodox' churches to the doctrine and the practice of the Kingdom of God is an inexcusable omission. The Evangelical Revival and the Society of Friends, both just mentioned, have done much more to advance Christian social progress than the movements he deals with. The book has merits; but its history is as inadequate as is its theology.

---

### A RABBINIC ANTHOLOGY.

The death of Dr. C. G. Montefiore has left a gap which nothing can fill. His learning, his humility,

and his sweetness of character, made him a unique figure among Biblical students, and everything he said and wrote was treasured by a great company, both Jewish and Christian. No man has done more to bring together the adherents of the two great faiths, or to expound them to one another. Though a 'Liberal' Jew, he never betrayed the least hostility to his 'Orthodox' brethren, and his latest work is one in which he collaborated with Mr. Herbert Loewe. Jews seem to manage these things better than Christians; we can hardly imagine a work produced jointly by Luther and Loyola. The book in question—posthumous as far as Montefiore is concerned—is *A Rabbinic Anthology* (Macmillan; 18s. net). It is a selection from the best things that post-Biblical Judaism has had to offer the world, a collection of choice 'flowers' from which weeds have been rigorously excluded. The 1661 passages chosen admirably illustrate the Rabbinic teaching about God and man, their nature and the relation between them. It is impossible to give details; the type of material cited is familiar, with its love of allegorical stories, its delight in epigram, and its insistence on referring every point, in the last resort, to the text of Scripture. The Rabbis were hampered by a doctrine of Scriptural infallibility in an extreme form, with the inevitable result that we sometimes meet with curious exegesis, but their instinct was, in the main, sound. There are notes of great value on many of the passages cited, but the reader will probably derive more benefit from the two Introductions—one by each editor—and the additional discussions at the end of the book. It should be observed that this anthology is not an attempt to expound the position of the modern Jew. As Dr. Montefiore so well says—and his colleague would be in full sympathy with him—the world has grown in every way, and much of what the old Rabbis believed would be out of place in a Copernican universe. Yet even the Liberal Jew recognizes the fact that his faith has come to him *through* the Rabbis, and is unintelligible apart from them. The history of Jewish thought does show a real progress; while it is not so far as Christianity from the Judaism of the age of Jesus (owing, partly, to the fact that it remained uninfluenced by Greek thought), it is, nevertheless, a very different thing, and not the least important feature of Rabbinic thinking is the way in which it overcame its necessary limitations.

In what has been said, it is the work of Dr. Montefiore that has received most attention. This is as Mr. Loewe would have wished, but his contribution is far from being negligible; some of the

most interesting passages in the book are those in which the two scholars record differences of opinion, and notes signed 'H. L.' are always instructive and important. Above all, we owe to Mr. Loewe the final preparation of one of the most valuable books on Judaism that have appeared in recent times.

#### A CONGRESS OF FAITHS.

For the last three years a group, composed of adherents of the various religions, have gathered to a Conference in this country, and have enjoyed discovering how much they have in common. This year they met in Cambridge, and *The Renaissance of Religion* (Arthur Probsthain; 7s. 6d. net) is the outcome of their 'congress of faiths.'

It is a rather disappointing book. Sir Francis Younghusband, the moving spirit in it all, has an introduction, marked by his usual charm of mind, and catholicity of heart. Radhakrishnan could not be uninteresting even if he tried. But, for him, his is a slight contribution. The 'Muslim View,' put by Sir Abdul Qadir, makes some appeal, not a little by the aptness of his quotations. Professor Tucci finds, surprisingly, much that is vital in what to most minds are the dry and mouldering bones of Lamaism; and Dr. Sen gives an account of how the Brahmo Somaj came to be what it now is. There is, too, an address on 'The Religious Drama,' and another rather inchoate one upon 'Immortality.' And all are followed by so-called discussion, painfully ineffective, even futile. Far the most satisfying thing in the whole book is Mr. Cheng Su's delightful contribution on Confucianism, though he might have given Mr. Cranmer Byng the credit for the beautiful translation which is quoted.

There was also a Public Session, at which Lord Samuel gave a virile address, optimistic even in these dark days; and Mr. Perera spoke arrestingly, but (most uncharacteristically), almost pugnaciously, from the Buddhist standpoint; and Mr. Kenna, on the American negro; and Señor Madariaga, with impressive shrewdness and insight. One would like to spend an evening with the Señor, and sit quiet, letting him unroll his mind on many things. For one would rise and go, a saner man, with his heart cleaned and freshened. There are also three Orders of Service, so to speak—one Muslim, one Hindu, one Buddhist. The last is printed both in Pali and in English. The translation is not full, nor altogether accurate. Pañca means, of course, five. Yet Pañca Sila is translated 'The Four Precepts'—as one might say the nine command-

ments—and sure enough the third, on sexual sins, is, for some reason, left out in the English. A rather disappointing book. But Mr. Cheng Su is delightful.

### CHRISTIAN PSYCHO-THERAPY.

We always feel that a book is going to be a good one when the author tells us that it deals with 'one of the greatest needs of the world.' We would even prefer to omit 'one.' We all feel in that way about our own subject. We smile when any one else says the same. But all the same you cannot write urgently and well of anything unless you feel that it is the biggest thing you know. This is what the Rev. J. A. C. Murray, B.D., says of the subject of his book—*An Introduction to a Christian Psycho-Therapy* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d. net). Mr. Murray is a clergyman, but he has made an exhaustive study of psychology on its healing side, and apparently has done some practical work in its applications to individuals. The purpose of his excellent book is to bridge the gulf between Christian doctrine and the discoveries of psychological research, and in especial to help the working minister to be more effective than he is in dealing with souls. He contends, truly enough, that not sufficient is done in our theological colleges to furnish the minister to meet really baffling human troubles, and that, while all ministers cannot be specialists, and while a little knowledge may be a dangerous thing if one presumes on it, yet ministers ought to have a better knowledge of what goes on in the lives of their people, and be prepared at least to avoid pitfalls that await ignorance.

And so Mr. Murray joins this big book (which is a first-rate contribution to the subject) with a practical aim. But it is not all 'practical.' It is a scientific account of the matter. He examines first the content of the mind, then the major mental and spiritual disorders. Then he discusses proved therapeutic methods, particularly that of analysis. The author repudiates the claim of either medical practitioners or materialistic psychologists to exclusive authority in the healing of the mind's troubles, and ably vindicates the right of Christian truth and inspiration to claim a necessary part in such a saving work.

We have read this book with pleasure. It is well-informed and well-written, and ought to have a real influence for good. There are things in it that suggest criticism. Like all psychologists the author is apt to over-emphasize the extent to which mental disorders exist. He sees them everywhere, whereas it is a matter of experience that they are com-

paratively uncommon. But this, and other matters of detail on which undue stress is laid, do not detract from its real value.

### THE FERRAR PAPERS.

There is a great collection of Ferrar Manuscripts at Magdalene College, Cambridge. They have belonged to the College for some hundred and fifty years. But only quite recently have their full range and value become apparent. During a cleaning and stock-taking of the College Library half a dozen years ago a large number of neglected Ferrar documents, including holograph letters of Nicholas Ferrar himself, came to light. And it appears that Mr. A. L. Maycock and Dr. Bernard Blackstone were the first people to make use of these documents.

At any rate, Mr. Maycock recently published the fruits of his researches in the volume, 'Nicholas Ferrar and Little Gidding,' which gives an account of the life of Nicholas Ferrar and of the community of Little Gidding, and which we have had the pleasure of reviewing. And now there lies before us a goodly volume, edited with an Introduction and Notes by Dr. Blackstone, entitled *The Ferrar Papers* (Cambridge University Press; 21s. net). This volume contains a 'Life of Nicholas Ferrar' (a composite of the surviving manuscript accounts), the Dialogue called by Dr. Blackstone 'The Wind-ing-Sheet' from its main theme (part of three folio volumes, bound at Little Gidding by Mary Collett, containing records of the Conversations held in the Great Chamber by the Maiden Sisters and others of the Little Academy), 'A Collection of Short Moral Histories' (part of a quarto volume in the hand of Francis Peck), and 'A Selection of Family Letters' (mainly autographs illustrating the character of Nicholas and his friends and the everyday life of Little Gidding). The frontispiece of the volume is a plate of Little Gidding church; there are seven plates of letters; and there is also a plate of a paper by George Herbert, who was a friend of Nicholas Ferrar.

We can but commend this scholarly edition of these interesting social documents to those who would make study of a deeply religious personality of seventeenth-century England and the community movement which he initiated. Nicholas Ferrar was a man of learning and affairs, but before middle age he retired to the practice of the 'religious life,' gathering round about him at Little Gidding a society of like-minded friends. Those who have been interested in Mr. Maycock's volume

may well go on to form a more intimate contact, under Dr. Blackstone's guidance, with the founder and the community of Little Gidding.

### THE ORIGINAL BUDDHISM.

Mrs. Rhys Davids, that iconoclastic higher critic in things Buddhist, pursues her crusade with unabated enthusiasm and zeal. In fact in none of her volumes does one find her position stated so effectively as in *What Was the Original Gospel in 'Buddhism'?* (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). In the final chapter 'Thus Far' she sums up her findings under some dozen headings, where all can see them for themselves. Enough to say that she believes that in the original Buddhism there is a very real teaching about the Divine, and a self in man, that there is no such over-estimate of ill and under-estimate of desire as some find fundamental in it; that the 'central' eightfold way is really a poor falling away from the first and vastly higher doctrine, that Jhana is communion with those beyond the veil, that the Brahma Viharas are a kind of televiolation, and so on.

Dean Stanley once flamed into Scotland with a course of Lectures upon Scottish Church history, which he understood in the most novel way. He was answered by Rainy in one of the most crushing replies ever given. After describing the great Scottish leaders as the Dean saw them, he exclaimed, 'What an array of fighting fools' these heroes of ours prove to be. 'And how great a man the Dean of Westminster who has seen through them all!'

Sometimes one has a feeling much like that in reading Mrs. Rhys Davids!

Yet her humility disarms, and her immense knowledge compels her views to be considered with an anxious seriousness at every step.

### FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE.

Bishop Westcott once said of Maurice: 'Few can teach nobler lessons, and I should feel it hard to say how much I owe to him directly and by suggestion.' The indebtedness of Dr. Westcott may well have been one of the impulses that set Professor Claude Jenkins, D.D., F.S.A., to write *Frederick Denison Maurice and the New Reformation* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). It was the considered judgment of Dean Church that this teacher has shown us a serious love of truth. He taught men also to look into the meaning of our familiar words, and to use them with a real understanding. Charles Kingsley has reminded thoughtful students of this theo-

logian's work of a memorable saying of his, 'The real struggle of the day will not be between Popery and Protestantism but between Atheism and Christ.'—Every theologian is bound to reach an apparent inconsistency of thought. We cannot express Christian truth in a syllogism. This may be the reason why R. H. Hutton could never quite reconcile Maurice's profound sense of the reality of sin with his emphasis as to the absolute completeness of redemption. Yet the withdrawal of God's presence was regarded by this thinker as a penalty for sin which could scarcely be exceeded. If the reprobates are 'left alone,' if they meet that direst of all nemesis, is not this the tacit recognition in Maurice's 'universalism,' that there is an area which even the divine redemption at its fullest hardly covers? If this be so, may not this satisfy R. H. Hutton's craving for a genuine, unvarnished insistence on the heinousness of sin, if even God's reconciling overtures may apparently be thwarted by man's impenitence?

Part of the book is taken up with Maurice's socialistic teaching, his work for democracy, and his friendship and service in the interests of working men. He regarded the Kingdom of Heaven as the great practical existing reality. It was to renew the earthly and make it a habitation for blessed spirits.

Education was another channel for his influence. He shares the views of Julius Hare that the task of the instructor is not to load with ready-made knowledge, but inspire with a love of learning, to expand the mind. He was a pioneer in the introduction of women to the learned professions. There are striking tributes in the book to the liberty that he brought to illustrious women of his age. Professor Jenkins has brought real knowledge of the period, and of the writings of Maurice to his task. If there is one feature that we miss it is that the background of the era, and the life are not sketched. A more vivid and telling picture of that setting would have won his readers to a more sympathetic response to the message of the man. Then we should have more readily entered into the commendation of Dr. Montagu Butler who wrote the biography—'Wherever rich and poor are brought closer together, wherever men learn to think worthily of God in Christ, the great work that he has laboured on for fifty years shall be spoken of for a memorial of him.'

A little book on the art of common worship has been published by the Abingdon Press: *The Art of Group Worship*, by Professor Robert S. Smith

(50 c.). There are six chapters on Why we Worship, What We do in Worship, The Leader in Worship, The Surroundings of Worship, The Materials of Worship, and How We can help Others to Worship. It is a small book on a great subject. And it is a valuable book on an urgent subject. Guidance is needed not only in our church life, but more especially in our church schools, where worship has been at a discount, and where above all the spirit of worship may be caught, and the child taught its beauty and value. And these chapters, simply and modestly written, contain just such guidance.

Mr. John Hilton is probably one of the most popular, if not the most popular, of broadcasters. He has been 'on the air' over a hundred and fifty times. And his popularity is easily explained. He *talks*. He does not merely read a written literary essay. And he takes pains to talk. And, of course, he talks about things we wish to hear about. And he talks sense, plain sense, out of a wise heart. And so his new book of broadcast 'addresses'—no, not addresses, talks, entitled *This and That* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net) will be very welcome. It will be widely read. For those who have listened to John Hilton it will be enough to say that these are what they have enjoyed on the wireless, and will immensely enjoy over again in print. For others we would say, get this book of genial wisdom and enrich yourself with it. Nothing is too great for Mr. Hilton, and nothing too small. This is a perfectly delightful book just about This and That.

*The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, vol. xvii. for 1936-37, published at New Haven, Conn. (\$2.50), has been delayed till this year, but has been worth waiting for. It contains a detailed account by Professor Albright of the excavations at Tell Beit Mirsim in the Bronze Age. It resumes the publication of reports begun six years ago, and is to be followed in two or three years by a volume on the Iron Age. The Tell, which is situated in the southern Shephelah, is believed by the excavators to represent the Biblical Kirjath-sepher (or Debir). It has no fewer than ten strata, the deepest of these being dated in the third millennium. Though it is the only excavated site of any consequence in Palestine where no tombs have been found, this lack is amply compensated by the enormous number and variety of articles found. The book contains forty-eight plates, as well as diagrams, plans of the site and work, and an index of the objects discovered. Its appearance will be

welcomed by archaeologists, who will find it a valuable source of information and of reference.

Professor W. Macneile Dixon's Gifford Lectures, delivered in Glasgow in 1935-1937, attained a popularity reminiscent of William James's Gifford Lectures on 'The Varieties of Religious Experience.' There was in them the same freshness of thought, felicity of diction, and the same power of handling philosophic subjects in terms within the comprehension of the plain man. There was, too, a certain similarity in the mental attitude of the two lecturers. As the one passed in review the varieties of religious experience in a detached and critical, if kindly, manner, so the other ranged over the whole realm of religious, philosophic, and scientific theory with keen and searching eyes and many a rapier thrust of criticism. The patient reader wonders if any ultimate ground of certainty will ever be reached, but at last, out of the amazing perplexity of life, there emerges faith in the rationality of things and in human freedom and immortality. Professor Dixon's lectures have now been issued in a cheaper edition—*The Human Situation* (Arnold; 7s. 6d. net). The volume is substantially bound, and apart from the fact that the pages are rather crowded and have no headings, it is great value for the money.

To the large number of books dealing with the Exodus, we have now to add a small volume by Mr. A. Lucas, O.B.E., F.I.C., F.S.A., honorary chemist to the Egyptian Department of Antiquities—*The Route of the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt* (Arnold; 3s. 6d. net). Long residence in Egypt and familiarity with the district, together with a careful study of the more important scholarly discussions of the problem, give Mr. Lucas a right to an opinion. In refreshing contrast to some of his predecessors, he writes as a scientist, modestly, thoroughly, and accurately; he can even use his observations of the habits of quails with good effect. He confines himself strictly to his subject, and avoids discussion of tempting side-issues. He accepts the more easterly position for Sinai, identifying it with the Gebel Bagir, and rightly rejects the view that the sacred mountain was a volcano. He accepts, too, the identification of Goshen with the Wadi Tumilat, and gives his reasons for rejecting various theories as to the route followed by the Israelites. That which he proposes is the modern pilgrim road from northern Egypt to the Gulf of Akaba, and he traces the itinerary in detail through three stages. From the Wadi Tumilat the road

understanding of Scottish character and religious life.

A popular edition has been issued of the biography of *Dr. John White*, by Mr. Alexander Gammie (Lassodie Press; 2s. net). It must be a delicate business to write the biography of a man still living, and one wonders what Solon would have said about it. But Mr. Gammie has a skilful pen, and with so live a subject it was not difficult to make a living book, and one which deserves a new lease of life.

For students of the English Bible we can commend *The Four-Fold Message*, by Mr. C. C. Ogilvy Van Lennep (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 10s. 6d. net). The writer's plan is 'to record all that any one or more of the evangelists say of each event or speech; to place all repetitions of each item together, one after another, irrespective of the order in which each occurs in any one of the four Gospels, taking care, of course, to avoid treating as a single thing matters which, though similar, are really two or more. Further, it is to omit nothing from any of the Gospels, and to insert nothing more than once. As a matter of fact only one word has been added to the text of the Authorized Version of the Gospels, and that word is Jesus, inserted at the beginning of His genealogy by St. Luke. No single word has been omitted.' A consecutive narrative is thus put together which is very readable, though the time sequences must in many cases remain doubtful. The narrative is divided into twenty-four chapters to each of which there is added a number of useful explanatory notes. An elaborate index of Gospel passages is given at the end.

*Arm the Apostles*, by Rom Landau (Nicholson & Watson; 3s. 6d. net), is the rather puzzling title of a book on Pacifism. The writer is convinced, as all Christians are, that war is contrary to the mind of Christ, and ought to be eliminated from human affairs. But, unlike many Pacifists, he is a realist and sees the difficulty of applying the absolute ideal rigidly at one point irrespective of the general moral level. In the present situation he feels that there are moral values in Britain's civilization which are worth defending even at the cost of war. At the same time 'although the present level of public enlightenment is too low to justify the immediate adoption of unmitigated pacifism, the latter must be the goal of every civilized country.'

The Oxford University Press, which has so honourable a reputation in printing and publishing the English Bible, has fitly celebrated the four hundredth anniversary of the setting up of the Bible in all the parish churches of England by the issue of a new edition of the Authorized Version, in crown 8vo, in large and exceptionally clear type. The claim is made, and may be granted, that 'it is the largest type and easiest-to-read Bible of its size.' The price ranges from 7s. 6d. in strong cloth binding to 21s. and upwards in fine India paper.

The same firm has also completed their beautiful edition of the Bible in the World Classics series by the issue of the New Testament in one volume (2s. net). It makes a handy little pocket edition of the Authorized Version, delightful to handle and pleasant to read.

From Messrs. Pickering & Inglis we have received a few of their popular Scripture calendars. The *Golden Grain Daily Meditation Calendar* (1s. 6d.) has a daily tear-off block with a text and meditation and a fine reproduction of a painting of Maidenhead Village. The *Golden Text* (1s. 3d.) has a picture of a sheltered creek, and a text and seed thought for each day. Two charming studies of rural scenes have been chosen for *Daily Manna* and *Grace and Truth* (1s. each), and *Young Folks* has a coloured photograph of a merry child with bowls of daffodils (1s.).

In *The Church of the Apostles and the Fathers* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net) the Rev. Francis E. Barker, M.A., A.K.C., has given us a very concise yet comprehensive survey of the constitution and history of the Christian Church throughout the first thousand years of its life. His book falls into three main parts, which deal respectively with the Church and the Ministry, Christian Worship, and Faith and Life. From this it will be seen that this is no mere catalogue of events, but a penetrating study of the life of the Church as manifest in its doctrine, worship, and practice. The work is done with great judgment and impartiality. One interesting feature is the amount of space devoted to the Eastern Church, which, of course, is less well known in the West. It should form an excellent text-book for study circles.

*Spiritual Exercises* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Hubert S. Box, B.D., Ph.D., is a Handbook for Directors of Souls compiled from the writings of Masters of the Spiritual Life. It is issued as a companion volume to 'Spiritual Direc-

tion' by the same author. Whereas that work dealt with the general principles according to which souls should be guided and trained, this treats of the particular practices that the director will commend to his penitents. Among the writers from whom quotations are given are F. W. Faber, St. Ignatius of Loyola, Louis de Blois, St. Teresa of Avila, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, and more especially John Baptist Scaramelli. In his *Directorium Asceticum*, known to us as 'A Guide to the Spiritual Life,' this last gives in the first of the four parts a summary of spiritual counsels on the way to reach Christian perfection; and in the volume before us this summary is itself abridged by Dr. Box. We cannot but agree with Dr. Oscar Hardman, who supplies a Foreword, that this is a 'very helpful little manual.'

There have been quite a number of brief histories of the Christian Church recently produced, most of them sound work. The most recent addition to the number is also, we fancy, the briefest—*Outline History of the Christian Church*, by Dorothea Jane Stephen, S.Th. (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net). It is one of the S.P.C.K. Educational Handbooks, and as an outline admirably fulfils the purpose of such a series. It is an intelligent and objective review of the outstanding events in the Church's story. The substance of the book was given in the form of lectures in India, and this accounts for its vivid and simple style. It may be warmly commended as a good manual for class teaching, but it will interest the general reader also, and probably inspire in him the desire for further knowledge.

We do not like the first words of the Preface which Mr. Robert M. Bartlett has written for his new book—*They Dared to Live* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). 'In an epoch of disillusionment and despair. . . ' Our age is far from being an epoch of despair. But at any rate we agree with what follows, that in this age there have been, and are, many in every walk of life who have lived, and are living, victoriously. And the writer gives us twenty-five of such men and women from widely different spheres—business, literature, art, medicine, law, education, philosophy, and religion. Twelve nations are represented, and the biographies include well-known names, such as Einstein, Romain Rolland, Oliver Wendell Holmes, C. F. Andrews, Masaryk, Kropotkin, Kagawa, and such little known ones, as Hu Shih, Creresole, and Trudeau. The story of these men is worth reading

for itself, but it would be very useful for teachers and preachers also.

The problem of providing schools with suitable books for the teaching of Scripture does not yet seem to be solved, and a new experiment has been made by Lt.-Colonel E. N. Mozley, D.S.O. His work, *A Guide to the Old Testament and the Apocrypha* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), is based on his experience of teaching in a Preparatory School, and is, apparently, intended for the use of those who have to deal with younger children. The book consists of two parts; the first eighteen pages are given to chapters on 'Our Debt to Israel,' 'Modern Views on the Old Testament,' and 'Historical and Geographical Notes,' the latter being supplemented by some useful points enumerated in an appendix at the end of the book. The greater part of the space is given to notes on different books of the Old Testament—the Apocrypha is dealt with in three pages—with suggestions as to what sections may be profitably read. Naturally the notes are very few, and are confined to points which the author considers to be of the greatest importance. The practical value of the book can be assessed only by an experienced teacher of young children; probably only Colonel Mozley himself can make the best possible use of the material supplied in it. On the critical side, however, it should be used with considerable caution. Colonel Mozley takes a much more 'advanced' view than any living higher critic, and his general presentation of the 'modern' position might well mislead a reader who had no other guide. There is an excellent Bibliography, though some of its details may need revision.

When reading devotional literature one has at times the uneasy feeling that the writers are describing ideal spiritual conditions of which we and they have little actual experience. But here is something unmistakably and impressively genuine, a rare piece of Christian evidence. The title is *I Was in Prison* (S.C.M.; 1s. net). It contains letters from German pastors now in prison to their families or friends. Twenty thousand copies were privately circulated in Germany before the booklet was confiscated by the police. This translation should be widely read throughout the English-speaking world. It gives wonderful contemporary evidence of the reality of Christ's presence and the sufficiency of His grace, of joy in tribulation and the power of prayer. It is in every respect a most heartsome and inspiring book.

understanding of Scottish character and religious life.

A popular edition has been issued of the biography of *Dr. John White*, by Mr. Alexander Gammie (Lassodie Press; 2s. net). It must be a delicate business to write the biography of a man still living, and one wonders what Solon would have said about it. But Mr. Gammie has a skilful pen, and with so live a subject it was not difficult to make a living book, and one which deserves a new lease of life.

For students of the English Bible we can commend *The Four-Fold Message*, by Mr. C. C. Ogilvy Van Lennep (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 10s. 6d. net). The writer's plan is 'to record all that any one or more of the evangelists say of each event or speech; to place all repetitions of each item together, one after another, irrespective of the order in which each occurs in any one of the four Gospels, taking care, of course, to avoid treating as a single thing matters which, though similar, are really two or more. Further, it is to omit nothing from any of the Gospels, and to insert nothing more than once. As a matter of fact only one word has been added to the text of the Authorized Version of the Gospels, and that word is Jesus, inserted at the beginning of His genealogy by St. Luke. No single word has been omitted.' A consecutive narrative is thus put together which is very readable, though the time sequences must in many cases remain doubtful. The narrative is divided into twenty-four chapters to each of which there is added a number of useful explanatory notes. An elaborate index of Gospel passages is given at the end.

*Arm the Apostles*, by Rom Landau (Nicholson & Watson; 3s. 6d. net), is the rather puzzling title of a book on Pacifism. The writer is convinced, as all Christians are, that war is contrary to the mind of Christ, and ought to be eliminated from human affairs. But, unlike many Pacifists, he is a realist and sees the difficulty of applying the absolute ideal rigidly at one point irrespective of the general moral level. In the present situation he feels that there are moral values in Britain's civilization which are worth defending even at the cost of war. At the same time 'although the present level of public enlightenment is too low to justify the immediate adoption of unmitigated pacifism, the latter must be the goal of every civilized country.'

The Oxford University Press, which has so honourable a reputation in printing and publishing the English Bible, has fitly celebrated the four hundredth anniversary of the setting up of the Bible in all the parish churches of England by the issue of a new edition of the Authorized Version, in crown 8vo, in large and exceptionally clear type. The claim is made, and may be granted, that 'it is the largest type and easiest-to-read Bible of its size.' The price ranges from 7s. 6d. in strong cloth binding to 21s. and upwards in fine India paper.

The same firm has also completed their beautiful edition of the Bible in the World Classics series by the issue of the New Testament in one volume (2s. net). It makes a handy little pocket edition of the Authorized Version, delightful to handle and pleasant to read.

From Messrs. Pickering & Inglis we have received a few of their popular Scripture calendars. The *Golden Grain Daily Meditation Calendar* (1s. 6d.) has a daily tear-off block with a text and meditation and a fine reproduction of a painting of Maidenhead Village. The *Golden Text* (1s. 3d.) has a picture of a sheltered creek, and a text and seed thought for each day. Two charming studies of rural scenes have been chosen for *Daily Manna* and *Grace and Truth* (1s. each), and *Young Folks* has a coloured photograph of a merry child with bowls of daffodils (1s.).

In *The Church of the Apostles and the Fathers* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net) the Rev. Francis E. Barker, M.A., A.K.C., has given us a very concise yet comprehensive survey of the constitution and history of the Christian Church throughout the first thousand years of its life. His book falls into three main parts, which deal respectively with the Church and the Ministry, Christian Worship, and Faith and Life. From this it will be seen that this is no mere catalogue of events, but a penetrating study of the life of the Church as manifest in its doctrine, worship, and practice. The work is done with great judgment and impartiality. One interesting feature is the amount of space devoted to the Eastern Church, which, of course, is less well known in the West. It should form an excellent text-book for study circles.

*Spiritual Exercises* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Hubert S. Box, B.D., Ph.D., is a Handbook for Directors of Souls compiled from the writings of Masters of the Spiritual Life. It is issued as a companion volume to 'Spiritual Direc-

tion' by the same author. Whereas that work dealt with the general principles according to which souls should be guided and trained, this treats of the particular practices that the director will commend to his penitents. Among the writers from whom quotations are given are F. W. Faber, St. Ignatius of Loyola, Louis de Blois, St. Teresa of Avila, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, and more especially John Baptist Scaramelli. In his *Directorium Asceticum*, known to us as 'A Guide to the Spiritual Life,' this last gives in the first of the four parts a summary of spiritual counsels on the way to reach Christian perfection; and in the volume before us this summary is itself abridged by Dr. Box. We cannot but agree with Dr. Oscar Hardman, who supplies a Foreword, that this is a 'very helpful little manual.'

There have been quite a number of brief histories of the Christian Church recently produced, most of them sound work. The most recent addition to the number is also, we fancy, the briefest—*Outline History of the Christian Church*, by Dorothea Jane Stephen, S.Th. (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net). It is one of the S.P.C.K. Educational Handbooks, and as an outline admirably fulfils the purpose of such a series. It is an intelligent and objective review of the outstanding events in the Church's story. The substance of the book was given in the form of lectures in India, and this accounts for its vivid and simple style. It may be warmly commended as a good manual for class teaching, but it will interest the general reader also, and probably inspire in him the desire for further knowledge.

We do not like the first words of the Preface which Mr. Robert M. Bartlett has written for his new book—*They Dared to Live* (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). 'In an epoch of disillusionment and despair. . . . Our age is far from being an epoch of despair. But at any rate we agree with what follows, that in this age there have been, and are, many in every walk of life who have lived, and are living, victoriously. And the writer gives us twenty-five of such men and women from widely different spheres—business, literature, art, medicine, law, education, philosophy, and religion. Twelve nations are represented, and the biographies include well-known names, such as Einstein, Romain Rolland, Oliver Wendell Holmes, C. F. Andrews, Masaryk, Kropotkin, Kagawa, and such little known ones, as Hu Shih, Creresole, and Trudeau. The story of these men is worth reading

for itself, but it would be very useful for teachers and preachers also.

The problem of providing schools with suitable books for the teaching of Scripture does not yet seem to be solved, and a new experiment has been made by Lt.-Colonel E. N. Mozley, D.S.O. His work, *A Guide to the Old Testament and the Apocrypha* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net), is based on his experience of teaching in a Preparatory School, and is, apparently, intended for the use of those who have to deal with younger children. The book consists of two parts; the first eighteen pages are given to chapters on 'Our Debt to Israel,' 'Modern Views on the Old Testament,' and 'Historical and Geographical Notes,' the latter being supplemented by some useful points enumerated in an appendix at the end of the book. The greater part of the space is given to notes on different books of the Old Testament—the Apocrypha is dealt with in three pages—with suggestions as to what sections may be profitably read. Naturally the notes are very few, and are confined to points which the author considers to be of the greatest importance. The practical value of the book can be assessed only by an experienced teacher of young children; probably only Colonel Mozley himself can make the best possible use of the material supplied in it. On the critical side, however, it should be used with considerable caution. Colonel Mozley takes a much more 'advanced' view than any living higher critic, and his general presentation of the 'modern' position might well mislead a reader who had no other guide. There is an excellent Bibliography, though some of its details may need revision.

When reading devotional literature one has at times the uneasy feeling that the writers are describing ideal spiritual conditions of which we and they have little actual experience. But here is something unmistakably and impressively genuine, a rare piece of Christian evidence. The title is *I Was in Prison* (S.C.M.; 1s. net). It contains letters from German pastors now in prison to their families or friends. Twenty thousand copies were privately circulated in Germany before the booklet was confiscated by the police. This translation should be widely read throughout the English-speaking world. It gives wonderful contemporary evidence of the reality of Christ's presence and the sufficiency of His grace, of joy in tribulation and the power of prayer. It is in every respect a most heartsome and inspiring book.

## Problems of To-day.

### III. The Incarnation and Political Ethics.

By THE REVEREND V. A. DEMANT, B.LITT., B.Sc., RICHMOND, SURREY.

It is becoming evident that behind the European struggle between totalitarian politics and those of the democratic societies lies a conflict of dogmas as to the nature of human existence. If the initiative which seems to have passed to the former is to be won back for more liberal ideas and practice, the battle will have to be fought on the plane of dogma rather than of ethics. For it is a dogmatic assurance that their moral aims are in line with the ultimate reality of things that generates in men the energy and confidence which seem now to be monopolized by the adherents of totalitarian régimes. They have achieved a unity between their aims and their dogma, which appears to be lacking in the communities who still cling to the democratic principle. It seems to be indicated that there is in the outlook of the relatively liberal States an incompatibility between their liberal ethics and the dogma about human existence upon which they have tried to erect them. The Christian mind in these countries rightly senses that there is something of abiding truth in the liberal idea, which has its parentage in the Christian tradition. It is the truth that the human person has a significance which he passes on to, and does not derive from, the social whole in which he exists. In religious terms, it is the truth that because man is a child of God and not merely a creature, he is the father and not the child of the State. He has rights against the collective life. But Christian realists are no less alarmed at the diminished vitality of this doctrine. It is therefore relevant to ask whether there is not in the dogma of historic Liberalism concerning the nature of existence something which is destructive of that truth in liberal ethics that the Christian mind justly considers to be its protégé. In as much as Christian assumptions about human reality proceed from light given in the Incarnation, it behoves Christians who feel that the threatened eclipse of liberal ethics violates an integral element in their faith, to discover how that truth enables them to handle this problem of Liberalism and Totalitarianism. This article is a brief attempt to set out that problem.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The argument will be developed more fully by the author in a forthcoming work, *The Religious Prospect*, to be published by Frederick Muller, in the spring of 1939.

The Incarnation presupposes the doctrine of Creation which expresses a specific dogma about the nature of reality. Creation means that the world is of God, but is not God. Creation and history have their origin and being in God who is eternal, timeless, absolute. Theology begins with the problem set by the Creator-God of Genesis subsequently declaring Himself to Moses in the words 'I am that I am.' Christian thought has been continually wrestling to hold on to the two affirmations that God is the only self-sufficient Being and also that the Creation has a meaning. God does not exhaust His Being in the fact of Creation, yet the world is of significance to Him.

There are two types of heresy which always threaten the richness of the Christian religion, the first destroying or minimizing the link of significance between the world and God, the second abolishing the distinction between them. Each type has two forms. The first comprises (a) tendencies, implied in most oriental faiths and in developments of Platonism, to regard the world of history as unimportant, an illusion or a nuisance; and (b) theologies which regard the historical world as so fallen that there is no possibility of fallen man, however redeemed, knowing the link between the world and God. This is the authentic outlook of Continental Protestantism. The second type implies a dogma which denies the reality of an eternal world behind the cosmic world of becoming. This is the characteristic heresy upon which the thought-modes of the modern world have been reared. It too has two forms, the first of which has frequently no religious reference: (a) Modern secular outlooks of humanist, evolutionary and dialectical type. They have in common the assumption that reality is confined to the world process; and (b) Liberal Christianity which tends, virtually if not in language, to confine God's action to His immanent activity in Creation. Revelation is an aspect of that activity.

The Incarnation presupposes the doctrine of Creation which, on the one hand, forbids the eternal element in the Godhead being explained away in the process of mere becoming, and, on the other, insists that the concrete world process is of divine significance and value. For, the Incarnation declares that Jesus Christ is God the transcendent

entering the historic world of becoming in which He already acts immanently, in order to declare its meaning and to restore it to its true purpose. It is thus the condition of Atonement by which man is enabled to establish a conscious link with the eternal, transcendent source of Being. Man is thereby delivered from the chain of causality in a fallen world and realizes his freedom.

We see, then, that out of the gospel of the Incarnation there springs a philosophy of the nature of existence. This philosophy is concerned with matters in which Liberalism and Totalitarianism are involved. The most vigorous and successful form of Totalitarianism in Europe to-day is the National Socialist régime in Central Europe. Its force lies not so much in its dictatorship or in its State absolutism, but in the conviction that these are instruments of the concrete folk-life with its roots in place, soil, blood, and historic destiny. Its three fundamental elements are: a vitalistic dogma by which the vitality of the concrete community is the final test of all truth and right, an organic theory of society in which the parts have significance only in relation to the whole, and a race mysticism which makes this biological element the bearer of the folk's cosmic destiny. This is openly and avowedly a dogma of becoming only. The moving process of historical existence is its own warrant. There is no absolute abiding truth about man by which it may be judged. It has not even a consummation in the future by which its progress may be measured. The present needs of political power are the final criterion. It is the political embodiment of 'Life-Force' theories, and in so far as it has a religious complexion, which swarms of Professors and Ph.D.s are busy giving it, it is definitely an immanentist paganism. It thus falls within the second category of the heresies first enumerated.

Liberalism has been a much less unified outlook. In fact, it has been two things, not one. On the one hand, it has been a doctrine and an ethic which are in real opposition to this totalitarian vitalism. This doctrine has four chief marks. It stands for the existence of an objective truth which can be reached by eliminating bias. This implies the possibility of the human mind disengaging itself from the relative, interested, position in which the thinker finds himself. The faculty of reason enables him to pass from a purely subjective, self-regarding attitude to an objective and disinterested one. Secondly, it believes in a general rightness which can be a ground of appeal from the self-interested desires of men. It assumes the notion of objective good and evil. The good is an attribute of a certain

kind of life and cannot be identified with the fact of life itself. Thirdly, there is a Natural Law in the constitution of existence by which the positive law of a particular legislature may be assessed. The State is the embodiment, not the source of law. Fourthly, a certain universalism assumes something common to all men which cannot therefore be defined by the relative position each holds in the social organism. Man brings something to his social relations and is not merely a product of them. All these marks of liberal doctrine imply a reality over and above the flux of events, a reality with which man is in some contact. By this contact he is more than a drop in the stream of becoming and can somewhat direct it. Only on this assumption has the person any rights against the collective life, for on the plane of the temporal process only the latter is more inclusive than the former.

But while holding this doctrine and its moral implications, Liberalism has more and more succumbed to a dogma of existence which denies any reality transcending the time process. It has come to equate reality with the flux of becoming. There is nothing in the absolute which is not in the moving process of cosmic history. Instead of presenting the truth about man as something which had to be continually fought for against the encroachments of the temporal order, the later teachers of Liberalism believed that the emergence of this truth was historically guaranteed. They tended to assume that recognition of the person was so assured that it was taken for granted as part of the recognition of reality. A whole line of thinkers from Rousseau to H. G. Wells have suggested that only ignorance of the facts was in the way. By adopting the conception of Progress and Social Evolution, Liberalism came to stand for the belief that perfection of being in man was something to be realized within and by the cosmic process of becoming. It held that this realization was being achieved through the destiny of the unqualified individual. Now, the totalitarian or anti-liberal revolt, while opposed to the doctrine and ethics of Liberalism outlined above, is in fact a fulfilment of this dogma that the whole of reality is in the world process. It is a revolt, not against the assumptions of Liberalism of which it is in fact a more robust embodiment, but against their application to individual man.

The truth in the Liberal doctrine cannot be sustained by the dogma of Liberalism, but only by a contrary dogma, namely, that man has roots in an eternal world beyond the temporal flux. This dogma is implied in the purpose of and need for the Incar-

nation which gives a meaning to human historical existence because it comes from beyond it, that is from the absolute unconditioned God who is the source of all being and existence. It is the supreme pledge that man is a spirit-centred creature not entirely submerged in the process of events. It tells that man has a specific nature with the roots of his being in the transcendent world.

Both political Liberalism and Totalitarianism place the key of history in the temporal process. Conservative and progressive forms of Liberalism differed only about the distance of the 'one far-off divine event' when that key would be delivered to man. Totalitarian politics hold that the key lies in the here and now of a particular folk history. Neither really offers a meaning to history. By contrast, the Incarnation gives the possibility of a meaning to history, because it is the penetration into history of God who is beyond history as well as in it. The Incarnation has a date and an address. It gives meaning to all events because it is itself a particular event with an absolute significance. History has no meaning if either nothing really happens, that is if the end is in the beginning all the time, or if particular points are a series of isolated, equally meaningless, events. In the Incarnation God made one event of absolute importance in history, because it is not of history. 'A moment in time, but not like a moment of time.'<sup>1</sup> The Incarnation therefore provides the only dogma upon which can be upheld the truth that man is not the creature or slave of history but in some sense its maker and interpreter, a truth essential to true Liberalism, but destroyed by the dogma of a one-dimensional temporal world common to the philosophies of historic Liberalism and Totalitarianism.

But, furthermore, the Christian doctrine provides some guidance in the struggle against Totalitarianism. This struggle cannot successfully be undertaken in the name of historic Liberalism, but only by means of a more satisfactory dogma than Liberalism provides for upholding the status of persons. Liberalism has been very strongly tinged with rationalism. By its confidence in reason it embodied a faded replica of belief in an eternal truth about man which is superior to the mere facts of historical existence. But it tended to ignore that human existence is for the most part set in irrational concrete, unrepeatable situations. By his roots in the earth, in local and national history, in collective emotions, in his unique individual circumstances, and so on, man thereby escapes the ordered categories of reason which can only handle what is

common to all men or a class of men. It is on these that vitalist Totalitarianism fastens, declaring that they are the realities of human existence. Liberalism took an abstract cross-section of the stream of human becoming, reasoned about it, and legislated for it. It thereby emancipated not actual men but an abstract atom of an individual. It believed, for example, that the relatively irrational economic factors would automatically be directed by the rational conceptions of political democracy. Owing to the failure of this belief, there arose, first, Communism which sought deliberately to bring the irrational economic factors into line with the rational political conceptions, and then Fascism and National Socialism which discard rational aims altogether and seek to give man status in the concrete, irrational, historical elements of his existence.

Christians concerned to uphold the status of persons against the mass must face this dilemma presented by the present historic situation: either the liberation of an abstract individual which leaves the person's actual life untouched, or the giving of status to the concrete person at the cost of submerging him in a stream of collective existence. If a doctrine of man derived from the Incarnation is to be brought to bear on this question, the truth of the Incarnation must be re-learned and taught as redemption of man by God the Son who is the eternal agent of Creation. These two aspects have fallen asunder in modern Christian thought: redemption has been understood as operating so inwardly that man's life in relation to the rest of the world receives no illumination, or the world order is conceived as of God immanent without the need of correction in the light of grace. We need a reaffirmation of the synthesis of Grace and the Natural Law as two operations of the same divine action. For by dismissing Nature and history from guidance by redemption, and by regarding the individual soul as the terminus of saving grace, our modern attenuated Christianity has not fulfilled the mission that would have saved us from the revenge taken by reality, or God, in this uprush of Nature-paganism. God acts upon man whether man knows it or not. Without man's awareness of the transcendent ground of his being, God acts upon him in judgment and wrath instead of as the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Man is pulled over from one false position to the opposite, by-passing all the time the centre of gravity of his true being.

But awareness of his true being, given in the Incarnation, should save man from the kind of dialectical determinism represented to-day by the

<sup>1</sup> T. S. Eliot, *The Rock*.

revenge of the biological elements in his existence against rationalistic absolutism. Such an awareness demands a presentation of the Incarnation in which the supernatural ground and end of existence which it affirms shall define the true order of values in his social and natural life. Christ manifested and defined the purpose and end of life, not the means of living it. But faith in Christ implies knowledge of a right, 'natural' order in the biological, mental, social elements of his existence, and therefore as definite a morphology of the human spirit as there is a morphology of man's mammalian organism. This right order is not discerned in the actual world, but it should be apparent in the light of Grace, which restores but does not destroy Nature. A doctrine of redemption which does not from its supernatural standpoint penetrate to restoring to their rightful significance work, money, family, State, even blood and soil, will have no weapon to offer Christians in their campaign against totalitarian oppression.

Another aspect of the same problem is seen in the fact that Totalitarianism does not uphold the general factors in humanity at the expense of the particular, as is often supposed. On the contrary, it is the totalitarian criticism of Liberalism that the latter, by envisaging only the common, general, universal aspects of mankind, does not affect the lives of actual persons. To redress this error Totalitarianism gives supreme significance to the particular people, nation, or class or race. It is thus an anti-universalist doctrine. It is Liberalism that has exalted the general aspects of man over his particular, accidental, unique, unrepeatable qualities. It has thereby built up a mode of civilized existence which could override the stark struggle of individual existences devoid of any general principles. But it has not been thorough enough, and while attending to only one aspect of political life under this discipline it has left the concrete life of men the victim of predatory interests.

Here, again, the doctrine of the Incarnation should give us the impulse and the discernment to bring both the particular and the general aspects of man within the sphere of divine restoration. The Incarnation of the transcendent God gives significance to particular men and events, as distinct from the idea that particulars have meaning only as parts of a whole. The 'accidents' in created beings and events are part of their significance. God becomes not only Man, but *this* man. Because every man is a particular man, Jesus Christ, in order to be representative Man, must be a particular man. But not a particular man in the same way as every other created man is, that is by distinction from others,

or He could not be representative of all. Only the God-man can be both *this* man and Man in general, 'taking up manhood into God!'

The dogma that every man has status by his link with God transcendent, signified in the Incarnation, marks off the Christian outlook from the two false positions into which the modern secular world is divided. The first is the assumption that man in general is more real than particular men. Modern Democracy has fallen into this error, emancipated an abstract human atom and built schemes upon the general idea of humanity. The second is the totalitarian assumption that men have status only as part of a *particular* social whole, thereby negating the human factor common to all men.

The to and fro movements by which man's being pulls him over from the error of giving absolute value to one aspect of his existence to the opposite heresy, suggests that there is somewhere a central position which he never realizes. It is not revealed in history, and so long as it is believed to be in the historic order it will be displaced by the judgment of God. The Incarnation reveals, from beyond, the central position from which man deviates. It gives warrants both for the general truth of man's personal significance and dignity, which is the truth in liberal doctrine, and for the truth that man is a concrete, organic being in a particular setting which is the truth for which Totalitarianism struggles. Without the first there can be only violence and conflicts between particular existences, men or peoples; without the second truth we are mistaking our ideas of man for real men.

Finally, Christian concern for the liberal truth of the status of persons must renounce entirely the dogma of Liberalism that man is an infinite personality with endless possibilities. This is a fantasy that leads to impotence and a comfort to all oppressive interests. The status and dignity of human nature, signified by the Incarnation, but given in Creation, belongs to a very limited nature. Man is a definite being; his existence is in becoming but his being is not. He is of significance in the created world by virtue of the *imago dei* and of his special place therein, not by the illusion of his limitless possibilities. By reason of his spiritual nature, which raises him somewhat out of the stream of the world process, he is liable to deny his contingency, dependence, and limits. That is sin. God has borne the consequences of our denial because we have not submitted to those limits. The Cross shows the Incarnate God having become dependent upon man in the final atoning act for man's independence of Him. The Incarnate Lord is the source of Grace,

the saving link between the transcendent God and man's need of restoration to his true nature.

The need of redemption, shown in the Incarnation and Atonement, means two things of importance for the question here discussed. It means, first, that the human best is involved in tragedy and requires God's initiative to save it from sinful pretensions. The order in which God is immanent cannot save itself. 'The Hound of Heaven' has to seek it out at every point. This challenges the optimism which ascribes to some aspect of His immanent order the absolute value that belongs only to the Divine Transcendent. Much liberal thought, both political and religious, which confines God's hand to His immanent activity and minimizes the contradiction in all human good, is hereby condemned. So are the modern secular paganisms which give absolute value to some terrestrial achievement or condition. The need of redemption means, also, that in the light of grace man is called upon to discern God's hand in the world order and to make decisions that affect history. The Incar-

nation determines the true hierarchy of values which enables decisions to be made without erecting the choice into the category of the absolute good. We have, therefore, a religious warrant for forming judgments on history and public affairs. There is thus rejected the secular pessimism of a Spengler and a Bertrand Russell, which sees no meaning in history, and the theology of a Luther and a Barth which tends to regard the world as a 'muck-heap' where decisions can only be made on purely secular grounds without any direction from the life in grace.

Christians will be helped in making their decisions by the consideration that at the present historic moment the common element of both Liberalism and Totalitarianism is the dogma that reality is all becoming. They deny the transcendent ground of being. The next heaven of history, in the hand of God, will demand a dogma of both eternal and temporal reality. The Incarnation is the ground of this conclusion, because it declares that the key of history lies in the eternal God whose Being exercises a continual pull upon the course of world existence.

## In the Study.

### *Virginibus Puerisque.*

Christ Shut Out.

BY THE REVEREND DR. C. W. BUDDEN, M.A.,  
CROYDON.

'There was no room for them in the inn.'—Lk 2<sup>d</sup>.

ONE starry night nearly 2,000 years ago two wayfarers from Nazareth climbed the limestone hill on which stands the little village of Bethlehem. These two, a man and his young wife, had journeyed with other travellers, but because the woman was suffering and they were slower than the rest, when they came to the town all the accommodation was taken up. They sought help in the inn but were refused admittance. Their plight was desperate, for the young wife was about to become a mother. But in the end they found shelter where the animals rested and the Babe then born found His cradle in a lowly manger.

Such is the well-known story of the first Christmas. A sad story of the Saviour of the world shut out at His birth, a story which has been repeated a million times, for there are many who still shut Him out.

But one cannot help feeling that had the people in Bethlehem only known who was to be born, every house would have been opened to the Mother. But they passed unrecognized.

Some years ago when King George V. was a young man, he and his brother were taking a holiday in Scotland, and wandering in one of the great mountain glens lost their way when night was descending. Seeing a light in the distance, and guessing it must be from some cottage, they made their way there and asked for shelter. It was refused. The royal brothers were not recognized. But can we not imagine the feelings of the inmates of that cottage when they learnt, as they must have done, whom they had turned away.

There is a very famous picture by an artist called Holman Hunt which shows Christ standing knocking at a closed door. The door is fast barred, and the bars and nails are rusty and bound by creeping tendrils of ivy, showing that it has never been opened. All round are weeds, brambles, and nettles. There stands the Saviour knocking. Can you guess the meaning of the picture? The closed door is the door of the human heart, a heart where there is no

room for Christ. 'And He can't come in until the heart is opened.

A little boy once attended a lantern lecture with his father when this picture was thrown on the sheet and in a moment of silence his shrill voice was heard :

'Father, why don't they let Him in?' And then he added: 'Perhaps they are at the back of the house and can't hear Him.' The little boy spoke more truly than he knew.

That is just how many people are found, occupied with the back kitchens of life and neglecting to go into the best and front rooms of the house, where they would find glorious ventures waiting for them did they but answer the call.

How different was the case of a little black Zulu boy in South Africa who had been told about Jesus and His love. He went home to his mistress, and when she asked him what he had heard, he said, 'Oh, it was about a wonderful Man. The people were very unkind to Him, and He died and went up to heaven; but He came down again and was like a little child in people's hearts.'

Then the lady said, 'Well, and what did you do?' With shining face the boy replied, 'I opened my heart and let the little Child Christ come in; and He came in, and my heart closed over Him, and He is safe inside.'

We often hear people speaking of the Second Coming of Christ. But I want you to realize that Christ is always coming, and the question is whether there is room for Him in your heart.

An Englishman, who was travelling in the Sudan, awoke one day from his midday siesta to find a noble looking Arab standing patiently beside him. The Arab greeted him courteously, and then inquired anxiously, 'Has the prophet Jesus come back to earth yet?' 'No,' said the Englishman, 'not yet.' 'Do you know when He is coming?' persisted the Arab. 'No,' again replied the traveller, 'No one knows that.' 'Ah,' said the Arab sadly, 'I hoped you might know. Because when He comes I should not like to miss Him. I should like to see Him and I should like to give Him greeting.'

Christ stands at the door of our hearts to-day, so let our answer be :

Unbar the door, we cry, unbar the door,

And let the Lord Christ in!

All other ways have proved our own ways vain,

His power alone can cleanse the world of sin.

His love alone can give us peace again.

Unbar the door, and let the Lord Christ in!

### Little Lonelies.

BY THE REVEREND C. M. HEPBURN, B.D., PITLOCHRY.

'Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by?'—  
La 1<sup>st</sup>.

In that perfectly charming colour film, *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*, which most of you have been begging to see, I expect, a new favourite, who will no doubt arrive in some of your stockings this Christmas-time, makes his bow. His name is Dopey. He's a quaint and funny little fellow, but a quite irresistibly likeable one. Of the seven dwarfs, who are all little men, Dopey is 'the littlest one,' or the Tiny Tim of the company. On that account the rest, I fear, take rather a mean advantage of Dopey, for when there is an undesirable task to be done it is Dopey who is pushed into doing it. At other times, like the last crow in the line, Dopey comes trailing after the others a trifle lonesomely. It is, however, these very things which win him our sympathy, his littleness and his loneliness. I believe God put something sympathetic in most of us, which doesn't like seeing the weak one oppressed or left out in the cold.

As I watched Dopey I began to picture to myself what it must mean to be loveless and lonely. I don't mean of course the sort of loneliness that one little girl murmured about :

Nobody wants me—not just now—

Ev'ryone's busy to-day somehow :

Daddy is writing, and Mummy is out,

And Emily Jane isn't nowhere about.

Then Toby is sleeping on the mat,

An' Susan keeps tellin' me 'Don't do that!'

She's scrubbin' the sink and the saucepan shelf.

Nobody wants me—acceptin' myself.

Oh no, the loneliness and the lovelessness I have in mind are very, very much harder than that. Supposing it was really the case that nobody wanted you 'acceptin' yourself. One can scarcely imagine anything which could be more sorrowful or dreadful than that.

And yet, although you and I in our land haven't that sorrow, in other lands there are many who have. Some men and women and boys and girls, a great number alas, seem wanted by nobody. All countries are shutting their gates against them. All the world is passing them by. In some cities they aren't allowed to play with those who used to be their chums, or to sit on the same benches at school. And there are worse things even than that. As I think of their sorrows I am reminded of another

poor mite in a village in China, who was deaf and dumb, thin and starving, whose legs were badly bitten by dogs, and whose mother had sold her as a slave, till some lady missionaries took pity upon her and adopted her as their own. Gwa-Gwa, which means 'Little Lonely,' was what she was called. And there are other, thousands of other Little Lonelies. Do mention them sometimes in your prayers, and help them whenever you have a chance.

And in so doing you will be true servants of your Lord and Master Jesus Christ, for Jesus was the unfailing Friend of all lonely ones. In His own experience He also knew what it was to be lonely, once exceedingly lonely, when near the end of His time on earth His own disciples forsook Him and fled, and many unkind and mocking people, caring nothing about His pain and sorrow, passed Him by as He hung on the Cross. So for His sake you will, will you not, be on the look-out for lonely folk, and particularly for any lonesome and forgotten amid all the festivity and happiness of Christmas-time, and do all you can to be their friends and bring gladness and sweetness into their lives.

Folks want a lot of loving every minute,

The sympathy of others and their smile.

Till life's end, from the moment they begin it,

Folks need a lot of loving all the while.

### The Christian Year.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Voices which Prevail.

By THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A.,  
ABERDEEN.

'And the voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed.'—Lk 23<sup>29</sup>.

Much has been said in criticism of Pilate, perhaps more than of any other Biblical character. And the criticism is, of course, justified. He not only consented to the crucifixion of Jesus—in itself a sufficient cause for criticism—but he consented against his own better judgment which makes his case all the more serious.

Pilate, if the Gospel record is to be trusted, found no fault in Jesus, was persuaded, indeed, that Jesus had been arraigned before him on a trumped-up charge in support of which no convincing evidence could be led. Convinced of that, men have protested, why didn't Pilate have the courage of his convictions and, refusing to be a party to injustice, proceed to release Jesus as at first he was minded to do? The only reason he himself could advance for his

dereliction of duty would be that such influential pressure was brought to bear upon him he could do no other than he did. But such a reason when suggested has served but to intensify criticism. To sell one's soul, to silence one's conscience, and all for the sake of retaining the friendship of Jesus' enemies and ensuring his own safety, was unworthy to a degree. Pressure or no pressure, it has been argued, Pilate should have followed the dictates of his own conscience and accepted the decision of his own mind.

Such criticism, we all agree, is deserved. But, if we allow that, is Pilate the only person at whom such criticism ought to be directed? Has no one else ever been guilty of such palpable cowardice? Have all men since Pilate's day had such a high sense of truth and honour and justice that, rather than offend any of them, they have preferred to suffer the loss of all things? Have we ourselves, who are, perhaps, in the ranks of Pilate's critics, never succumbed to the influential pressure which has been brought to bear upon us and followed something other than the dictates of our own conscience?

The truth is that the voices which prevailed in Pilate's case have often prevailed in the centuries since, and too often do they prevail in our day. What were these voices?

1. First of all, there was *the voice of the majority*. The plain fact which faced Pilate first of all was that he formed a minority of one. The rulers of the people and the chief priests were united in their opinion of Jesus and in their decision regarding the ministry He was conducting. Socrates once indicated 'that in a question of *right* mere suffrage can never be taken as conclusive,' but Pilate, faced by a majority, lacked courage to adhere to the decision of his own mind.

Having regard to the history of the world can we truthfully declare that the voice of the majority has not prevailed in cases other than Pilate's? Let us be quite clear about things. Sometimes the majority are right, sometimes their opinion is the only reasonable one in the particular circumstances; yet Socrates' warning must be kept in mind, 'that in a question of *right* mere suffrage can never be taken as conclusive.' The fact that the greater number of people in a community hold a particular opinion is not by itself an infallible proof of the truth of their contention. Yet how often has the mere fact of numbers decided issues! In our own experience, to deal with something of which we have intimate knowledge, has the fact that we were alone against many when a certain subject was

debated never influenced us to doubt our own judgment and to stifle our conscience? Afterwards we may have been ashamed of our cowardice, of our capitulation to the force of numbers, of our unwillingness to be reckoned 'odd.' But most of us can recollect to-day some occasion on which we were as deserving of criticism as Pilate was. For the fact that we formed a minority of one overwhelmed us as it overwhelmed him.

In criticising Pilate, we must be careful in matters of private and of public interest that we do not fall into his error. Where truth and honour and justice are concerned every man is under obligation to exercise his own judgment. It may be when he does so he will come down on the side of the majority, but his only valid reason for so doing is that he is personally convinced of the position he has assumed and not because he wants to be on the side of the big battalions.

When we think of it, the world in which we live has benefited incalculably from the courage of folk who, unlike Pilate, withstood the opposition of the majority—from the courage of such as Columbus who did not allow others' scorn of his contention to shake his own conviction, from such as Simpson whose use of chloroform was at first derided, from such as Florence Nightingale who, in face of convention, set sail to nurse the wounded at Scutari.

The majority has not always been right—not by a long way.

2. *The second voice* which prevailed in Pilate's case, a voice which has often prevailed in the centuries since, and which sometimes prevails to-day, *was the voice of important people.*

Confronting Pilate at the trial were the rulers of the people, men who were in positions of influence, who, if Pilate dared to act contrary to their direction, had it in their power to make his life uncomfortable. At all costs friendly relations with them must be maintained. After all, what did Jesus matter, compared with being in the good graces of the leaders of the people? So Pilate, stifling his conscience, came down on their side.

Are there any amongst us who would say that such conduct has never characterized any except Pilate? Any who would care to maintain that truth and honour and justice have never been sacrificed to vested interests and to the friendship of important people? Any who would care to say that the nations of the world, in framing their policies, have followed truth and honour and justice undeviatingly and with no thought of the cost such loyalty entails?

There are many amongst ourselves, who, thinking seriously of the voice to which Pilate capitulated, are driven to confess, if we are to be honest, that it is a voice to which we have capitulated also. There was a cause we wanted desperately to sponsor, there was an injustice done to some one which roused our indignation, there was a flagrant wrong we desired to put right, but our tongues were tied by important people whose friendship it seemed imperative we should retain. In that case, in criticising Pilate we are criticising ourselves. If he is deserving of condemnation, no less are we.

Do you remember how Jesus sent His disciples forth to preach and how, knowing the world better than they, He gave them certain counsels to guide them in their work? 'What,' He said, 'I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops. And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.' If that means anything it means this, that Jesus' disciples were being encouraged to give first place to truth and honour and justice at whatever cost, to preach the gospel with which their Master entrusted them without fear or favour. Better that they should offend important people than offend God.

Have we thought sufficiently of what this world owes to folk who refused to sacrifice their principles to people of importance? To such as Martin Luther, John Knox, Andrew Melville, and many more? Have we thought of how badly the world of our day needs men and women whose tongues are not tied by vested interests and who, at whatever cost to themselves, are prepared to adhere to their convictions? Pilate sacrificed his convictions in order to retain the friendship of the rulers of the people. In so doing, he, all men are agreed, stands condemned.

3. *The third voice* which prevailed in Pilate's case *was the voice of the experts.*

Who ought to know Jesus' merits and demerits if the chief priests didn't, Pilate may have argued. After all, were they not men who had been trained to think, who had devoted themselves to a particular study, and who had attained eminence in their profession? Surely it were folly to act contrary to their direction. What Pilate forgot was that even experts are not infallible, that a man who is an expert in one subject is not necessarily an expert in all subjects, that the judgment of the chief priests did not rid him of his responsibility to think for himself.

It is curious, is it not, the fascination big names

have for certain people? When the soldiers who on one occasion had been commissioned to arrest Jesus returned without Him and declared that in all their experience they had never heard any one speak as Jesus spoke, do you remember how their superiors endeavoured to argue them out of their conviction? 'Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on Him?' they asked, suggesting by such a question that where experts had been cautious it behoved lesser men to be careful.

To-day when some attack the faith which we profess they quote at great length the unfavourable pronouncements upon religion made by men eminent in science, in medicine, in letters, or in politics, obviously under the impression that because a man is eminent in science or in medicine, in letters or in politics, he is specially qualified to speak upon religion. And such a contention is, of course, quite unsound. When the mainspring of my watch snaps, I am never under a constraint to take my watch to a shoemaker for repair. With all men I have a profound respect for shoemakers but, where a watch is concerned, I prefer it should be placed in the hands of a watchmaker.

Let us disabuse our minds of all false ideas. All of us respect the experts, are grateful for the contribution they have made to knowledge, but because a man is an expert in one sphere it doesn't necessarily follow he is an expert in all spheres. Besides, the understanding of religion, and, in especial, of the gospel of Jesus Christ, is not conditional upon academic training and equipment. The humblest man is capable of understanding the things which Jesus said and of reaching a decision regarding them. And, while an expert by his utterance may attract us to, or draw us from, religion, *in the last resort*, it is neither greatly helped nor greatly hindered by the pronouncements which men eminent in certain spheres may make.

In religion let us each follow the dictates of our own conscience and the decision of our own mind for, whether we are scientists or politicians or no, God gave every man a conscience and a mind and to these God expects every man to keep true. Pilate, overawed by the experts, chose to follow *them* rather than the leading of his own conscience. And to-day he stands condemned.

The voices which prevailed in Pilate's case have prevailed in the centuries since and to-day they are still prevailing. Knowing that, and knowing, too, the error into which Pilate fell, it behoves us all to be careful that in regard to truth, honour, and justice, we may be found faithful.

#### FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

##### The Well of Bethlehem: An Advent Message.

'And David longed, and said, Oh that one would give me drink of the water of the well of Beth-lehem, which is by the gate!'—2 S 23<sup>16</sup>.

David is hiding from King Saul in the cave of Adullam. Bethlehem, the home of his childhood, is in the hands of the Philistines, and he seems far away from the peace of those early days. Memories crowd upon him. A fugitive and outlaw, parched with thirst in the wilderness, nothing will revive him but water from the well of Bethlehem which is by the gate. When George Borrow was travelling in Wales he came to the source of the River Severn. It was a little pool of water and it appealed to his romantic nature. 'Let me drink at the fountain-head of this mighty river,' he said, 'that I may be able to speak about it with confidence and authority.'

Can we get back to the source of our religion like that? Can we get back to Bethlehem, to the well at the gate? We should still have our experience and the experience of sixty generations behind us if the Gospel records were lost; for the Christian Church believes in a living Christ, the same to-day as yesterday, the same for ever. All we have to do is to look up to Him and look forward to His coming again. But some ask: 'Is the Christ of faith and experience the Christ of history? Can we be sure that when we read the Gospel we are reading the words of those who had seen our Lord? We want to feel firm historical ground under our feet. Can we get back to the beginning and drink of the well of Bethlehem which is by the gate? We can answer these questions for ourselves. Let us travel back along the banks of history and trace the mighty river to its source.

Along those banks we meet the men who made their mark in the Christian life, and we find them everywhere reading the Gospels we read to-day. We travel through the Middle Ages and see Thomas à Kempis writing his book on *The Imitation of Christ*. Whilst Chaucer was writing *The Canterbury Tales* we see William Langland brooding on the Malvern Hills over *Piers Plowman*, the people's Christ who comes to save them from their sins. We travel on through monastic times, finding human nature, in strange garb and speech, very much as it is to-day, till we come to the fourth century. We stop there because we meet a man who wrote a history of the Church from the days of the apostles to his own—Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea. Eusebius is accepted to-day as a trustworthy historian, and no one

seriously doubts that his work, with the Epistles of St. Paul and the writings of St. Luke, are the pillars of Church history.

Through him we get into touch with people who link the fourth century with the first. One of them lived at Alexandria. Origen was born in 185, in dark days for the Church, but he survived to win fame both as a great scholar and a bold champion of the Christian faith. Whence did he gain his weapons? From the same armoury which provides them to-day. An eminent authority has said: 'If the Gospels had all been finally lost in that age of persecution, we could recover them from the writings of Origen.'

Leave the Eastern Church for a moment and travel to the West.

It is clear that at the beginning of the third century the Gospels were the Court of Appeal in all controversy. Remember that the Church, East and West, was not under any central authority so as to make the Church uniform in all her practice. Yet in churches so far apart as Alexandria and Carthage, Smyrna and Rome, they drank from the same well. They disagreed on points of Church order and discipline, they quarrelled as we do, but they never doubted that in reading the Gospels they were in contact with the Head of the Church.

Many of these people lay themselves open to criticism. We would not endorse everything they said, and they used methods of argument we could not adopt. We find Irenæus (Bishop of Lyons) writing this in 180: 'It is not possible that the Gospels can be either less or more in number than they are, for, since there are four principal winds, it is fitting that the Church should have a Gospel with four pillars.' This naïve argument does not appeal to us, but it proves that in that busy city of Lyons in the second century they had four Gospels and that their authority was unquestioned.

We are coming nearer to the well of Bethlehem, for this Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, came originally from Asia Minor, and it was there that the Apostle John had died a hundred years before. Just as there were people in the middle of the nineteenth century who had known Mrs. Thrale, who had been a personal friend of Dr. Johnson, so there were people in the second century who had the same kind of contact with St. John. In his youth Irenæus had been a pupil of Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. These were difficult times. Lyons was the centre of persecution under the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, who (in the words of Gibbon) 'despised the Christians as a philosopher and punished them as a sovereign.' Irenæus had seen his predecessor in the Bishopric

die in prison, but the blood of the martyrs was the seed of a vigorous Church. We are not to think that there were no failures. Many could not endure the test of persecution, others renounced the Christian faith for a philosophy of their own. The Bishop had a friend, Florinus, who went back and walked no more with him. We owe to this an allusion to the chain of faith which linked the Church with the first disciples. This is how the Bishop appealed to his lost friend: 'I saw thee when I was still a boy in Asia, in company with Polycarp. . . . I can describe the very place in which Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, and how he would describe his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words.'

So we get nearer and nearer to the well. Polycarp was martyred in 155. He was a very old man then, and we have a record of his trial. When the judges urged him to deny his faith, this was his simple reply: 'Eighty-and-six years have I served Him, and He never did me any wrong; how, then, can I blaspheme my King, my Saviour?' Eighty-six years! So he was born before the year 70, before the destruction of Jerusalem. Fifteen years before that the Apostle Paul had left Ephesus with these memorable words: 'Bonds and afflictions await me, but none of these things move me . . . so that I might finish my course with joy and the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus to testify the gospel of the grace of God.' How near we are to the source of our religion! We are in touch with the apostles, who walked by the Sea of Galilee with One whom they learnt to call Master and Lord!

What have we gained? We have firm historical ground under our feet. We are as sure of the coming of Jesus Christ on the earth as we are of the coming of Julius Cæsar. Yet who so helpless as a dead Cæsar! A dead Christ could do nothing for us, but the message of the Church to a changing world is always this: 'Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.' Advent is past, present, and future, and they blend into one. The Master who came into this world has sustained the Church throughout the ages. He is the living Christ who is always coming into our life and will finally come in judgment. So we look back to Bethlehem whilst we look up to One who always shares our life, and we look forward to His final coronation day. This is the wonder of Advent. History and experience agree; what was true then is true now; the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith are not two, but one inseparable Reality!

Greet the living Christ with your love and obedience.

In your hearts enthrone Him ;  
There let Him subdue  
All that is not holy,  
All that is not true :

For all wreaths of empire  
Meet upon His brow,  
And our hearts confess Him  
King of Glory now.<sup>1</sup>

#### CHRISTMAS DAY.

##### The Prince of Peace.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN MONTEITH, M.A.,  
BRIDGE OF WEIR.

'Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given : and the government shall be upon his shoulder : and his name shall be called . . . The Prince of Peace.'—Is 9<sup>o</sup>.

Twenty-four years ago to-day a band of men who had been foes, met together as friends, exchanged their little Christmas gifts, sang together their Christmas hymns, and shook hands. They were soldiers of Britain and soldiers of Germany, meeting in No-Man's-Land on the first Christmas of the World War. What they did was held to be a grievous breach of discipline ; they had 'fraternized with the enemy' : but they had borne witness before the whole world that Christmas Day has nothing to do with warfare. And we to-day have come to Christmas with much the same feelings. We are approaching the end of a year which has made history. Frontiers have been altered, armies have marched and fought, and death has fallen from the sky. In our peaceful homes we have looked death in the face, and seen him turn from us for a season. We have known fear : we have known mercy. So this year Christmas cannot be what it has been in years that are past. It is not sufficient that it should be a time of light-hearted jollity, of sentimentality and nothing more. It is a day when we must gather together as Christian men and women, and make our avowal of the Christmas faith that God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth. In times like these old words take on new meanings ; and to-day the angels' song rings out with a new challenge. 'Peace on earth, goodwill to men.' Only so can there be Glory to God in the Highest.

But when we call Jesus 'The Prince of Peace' is that any more than an empty phrase ? The

world ignores his princely sway. He is not acknowledged as a Prince. It is as contrary to outward seeming as the strange words that came from the lips of Simeon when he welcomed the six-weeks-old Christ to the Temple, took Him in his arms, and blessed God that he had seen the fulfilment of all his promises. 'Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation.' He knew that this baby was God's Salvation, though at the very moment He may have been whimpering and disquieted at the old man's unskilful embrace. He was God's Salvation, that helpless little child, dependent on a peasant woman's care ; the in-fant, not-speaking Word of God, that was with God before the world began. There is a truth that is not apparent to the outward eye or ear, but is apprehended by faith only. Simeon had waited long for the consolation of Israel, and now he knew, because God told him, that the hour had come. 'The government shall be upon his shoulder : and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.' Two thousand years have not sufficed for Jesus to grow to the full enjoyment of His titles and dignities. The newspapers do not tell of His government. Only the eye of faith can see Him for what He is. But every man and every woman who has been received into the household of the faith must come to-day and acknowledge Him for what He is, and not what He seems to be.

We must fulfil the destiny that challenges us in the angels' song. We must bring to the Christ-child the offering of peace which is His due. But how shall we bring peace to our fearful world ? First of all, by seeking peace in a place that is very near to every one of us, in our own hearts, and in our own homes. When the necessity of world peace dawned upon us, we sought it in the wrong place. We sought it in conferences between nation and nation, when we should have prepared for it in our own homes. The first necessity is that we should be ourselves peacemakers. I wonder who invented the phrase 'charity begins at home.' It is not always properly understood ; sometimes it is made an excuse for an unchristian and unlovely spirit. It is of such antiquity that, as in the Authorized Version of the great chapter in first Corinthians, 'charity' means not 'almsgiving,' but 'brotherly love.' If the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, it will be evident in our homes, in our villages, in our congregations, and from them it will spread to the State and the world at large. But it can never pass in the contrary direction, from the concert of the Powers to the individual life. We are too much

<sup>1</sup> M. Devine, *The Poet-Preacher of Vere Street*, 47.

obsessed by the horror of international war, and not enough by the horror of disunity in family life. 'Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth! And the tongue is a fire, it setteth on fire the course of nature, and itself is set on fire of hell.' The first essential for peace is that we should master ourselves, and acquire a capacity for living with one another in the spirit of the Christ who is the Prince of Peace. How can we expect great nations to swallow insults to their honour, when we ourselves have not learned to give soft answers for hard words and good for evil? We must acquire a technique for living with our familiars when they are on edge and tired, harassed and anxious. Then we shall find that matters, instead of going from bad to worse, will go from bad to better. We shall never learn how to avoid war on the world-wide scale until we have learned how it is done in miniature, at our own firesides.

But while we seek to find peace in our own homes, we must not forget to seek it also at the very ends of the earth. The imperative of peace is one with the urgency of the evangel throughout the world. Ultimate peace is not possible in a world where one nation remains that has not yielded to the love of God revealed in Jesus Christ. When the Christian nations have been freed from their fear of one another, they must also be freed from their fear of the non-Christian nations. There can be no stability in a world that is not completely won for Christ. The cause of peace is the same as the cause of Foreign Missions. But if that is so, must we wait until generations of Christian teaching have slowly taught the convert peoples the full mystery of Christ? It does not take generations to make a man a Christian, for those who have newly entered into freedom have clearer eyes than those who have hardly noticed that they were born free. In our lives, who are the heirs of a thousand years of Christian teaching, there are inconsistencies to which we are blind; but they are obvious to the convert. He is aflame with a zeal for his new-found Saviour that we have forgotten, or have never known. He is in the mood for giving the Sermon on the Mount a trial that is far from the mood of the civilized world at the present time. He knows that if Christ is the Son of God, all men are brothers, of one blood to dwell on all the face of the earth.

At home we are too much inclined to think of the Church of Christ as centred in our own congregations, and occupied with our own concerns. Our Saviour has true servants in many lands, and these true servants are all thinking this Christmas Day of the Prince of Peace as we are thinking of Him, and some

of them perhaps with fewer reservations than we. When Elijah complained on Horeb that he was alone in Israel, that all the others of his people had forsaken the covenant and thrown down the altars, he was reminded that there were seven thousand in Israel who had never bowed the knee to Baal. How many thousand thousands are there, where we look not for them, who are putting Christ first, before people or blood or ideology? When you think what that means it is not an easy thing to do. And yet the wonderful thing is, that in every land there are men who are coming to think of Jesus as the first choice in life, enough by Himself though all else should be taken away from them.

Have you ever heard of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches? It is an association which seeks to bring together Christian people of diverse races, who have heard the call for peace and are ready to answer it. Last August the Council of the Alliance met in Norway, and was attended by delegates from Germany and Czechoslovakia, Italy and Spain, France and Great Britain, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Portugal, the United States, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, Scandinavia and the Baltic States, Greece, Albania, and China. At the conclusion of their meeting they issued a message to the world from which the following words are a quotation. 'Hopes for a peaceful world, based on the appeal to natural forces of human goodwill, have been frustrated and changed into scepticism and discouragement. But we do not despair, for Christians have a deeper ground for peace. We depend upon God, upon His redeeming grace manifested in the Cross of Jesus Christ, the only effective source of goodwill in our sinful world. . . . We have to bear witness to Christ, the only conqueror of ill-will and sin, of which war is the grim consequence, receiving power from Him and accepting the obligation He lays upon us.' Germany is still the land from which the Reformation came. Italy is still the home of the Roman Church, and however much we may differ from it, we are forced to own that in the deepest things of the faith the Roman and the Protestant are one. And in Japan there stands the peerless figure of Toyohiko Kagawa, and round him an ever-growing church.

If these should all be true, and ourselves with them, what may be the consequences? We in this country have no right so much as to doubt whether they will be true or not, for some of them have resisted already even to blood. The Prince of Peace has His servants who have never bowed the knee to another. The full enjoyment of His principality is

on the way, even now it may be very near. The great matter is that we should not lose our vision, for where there is no vision the people perish. The children of Israel might have entered into the Promised Land a generation earlier than they did. When first they approached it, they sent out spies to reconnoitre; the great majority reported the insuperable difficulties they had discovered, the stature of the inhabitants, the impregnability of the fenced cities and so on, but there were two, Caleb and Joshua who saw beyond the difficulties. They beheld a land flowing with milk and honey, and they remembered that the Lord was on their side. And when the majority report prevailed, they kept their vision in their hearts, and kept on talking of it and working for it; and when the time came they had a united people behind them. Some day, and it may be very soon, the far-scattered minority who own the Saviour as the Prince of Peace may become a majority and prevail. God is on our side, and with God, all things are possible.

#### SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS DAY.

##### Faith and the Future.

'If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye might say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou plucked up by the root, and be thou planted in the sea; and it should obey you.'—Lk 17<sup>6</sup>.

In the land and the time into which Jesus was born, men looked upon the future in a curious and to us hardly intelligible fashion. They knew themselves to be God's chosen people; and from that they inferred that they should be lords of the earth. But, as one Empire succeeded another and trod them underfoot, they began to fall into despair of any deliverance through the processes of history. So they came to believe that God must be intending one of these days to interrupt the course of history and deliver His people by a summary act. In time this belief grew into what we nowadays call *Apocalyptic*, and was dramatized as the coming, in great power and glory, of the Messiah, riding the clouds of heaven and leading legions of angels, to overthrow the alien invader and establish His own folk in a proud independence.

Now this expectation did to some extent colour the mind of Jesus, and at one time very deeply coloured the mind of St. Paul; and the New Testament is overshadowed by it. But this kind of outlook upon the future always came and still comes in times of political pessimism. During the Great War there was a time when events had apparently broken loose and seemed to be past

human control. It looked as though there was no reason why the War should ever stop. Just then Mr. Wells published a book called *Mr. Britling Sees It Through*. In that book Mr. Britling discovered God. And then lots of people discovered God. They said in their hearts, 'God will see us through.' Just how, they did not know. But it was the same temper.

The trouble with this view is that it converts God into a *deus ex machina*—a God we can get along very well without until we have got ourselves into trouble, a sort of emergency-God, who can be counted upon to contrive a happy ending to the calamities that by our follies we bring upon ourselves. The one thing that we must establish in our minds about the future is that God works through the normal processes of history.

Now though the War did move some shallow people to a false outlook on the future, it cured a multitude of more intelligent people of another fallacy into which they had more or less fallen. The great scientific event of the last century was the discovery or rather the formulation of the evolutionary hypothesis by Charles Darwin. The picture it presented was that of the slow, irresistible unfolding of life from the minutest beginnings up at last to man: and it is a view which in a general way and with some qualifications is shared by all thinking people to-day. But there were some who said, 'Why should we suppose that this development stops? Why should it not be going on still?' And so was born the doctrine of Progress which coloured everybody's thinking in the last generation. It was as though we were all travelling in a sort of cosmic stage-coach up a gently inclined plane to the city of God. 'Always,' cried Herbert Spencer, in an ecstatic moment, 'always toward perfection is the mighty movement!' The War cured us of that superstition of a fated and inevitable progress. We know better to-day. We know that there is no inevitability of human progress.

It is curious, looking back to-day, how we ever came to fool ourselves into this faith in an inevitable progress, in the certain perfection of mankind. Jesus, for instance, did not believe it. Once He asked a question which revealed the doubt in His own heart about the human future: 'And the Son of man, when he cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?' Jesus was evidently not what we nowadays call an optimist. That does not mean that He was a pessimist. He did not disbelieve in the perfectibility of man; but He did not believe in the certainty of human perfection. He knew that the materials and the possibilities of perfection

were present in human nature ; but He knew also that there was a perversity in human nature that made the perfection doubtful.

The doctrine of fated progress left human freedom out of account. The early evolutionist saw no freedom anywhere in Nature. But the later evolutionist has tended to see that the process of evolution was actually making for the bringing forth of a free agent. And one prominent biologist of our time has said that the future evolution of man has been turned over to human kind to direct. Which simply means that the future is in our hands. We are the arbiters of to-morrow.

Just as optimism is a sort of faith in the teeth of the facts, so pessimism is despair in the teeth of the facts. Both optimism and pessimism are at bottom irrational attitudes ; and the facts of life justify neither. Take a cross-section of life at any point and we find it a mingling of good and bad, of promise and menace. No man can look at the facts of life as a whole and still be either an optimist or a pessimist in the conventional sense.

What, then, is the alternative ? Well, the best word for it, though it has had some elasticity in use, is *realism* : by which we mean a candid contemplation of things as they are. But we do not stop there. With realism, we have *faith*. We are living in a world of time, for ever passing from the known to the unknown ; and faith is the faculty by which we make that passage. Faith is our faculty for negotiating the future. Suppose a man is going on a journey to-morrow ; and he packs up his grip to-night to prepare for the journey. What an act of faith is involved in that ! He is assuming that there will be a to-morrow, that he will be alive to-morrow, that the train he purposes to go by will start out at the appointed time ; and, by packing his grip to-night, he is acting on these assumptions. And that is faith : acting on reasonable assumptions (the assumption must be reasonable, else it is not faith—it is credulity or superstition).

But that is not faith in the sense in which we use it in religion. There are two words which we use as synonyms of faith—*belief* and *trust*. Belief is the assent of the mind to a proposition which cannot be proved by the usual processes of demonstration. That, however, does not distinguish *belief* from *opinion*. An opinion is a view which lies on the surface of our minds and makes no difference to us. But the peculiar quality of a belief is that it discharges itself in an act. Take, for instance, the proposition that God exists. Now, we know men who hold that opinion, but we know it is only an

opinion, because they go on living as though God did not exist. But when it is a belief it expresses itself in acts and attitudes. But the kind of act it discharges itself in will depend upon what we think God to be. 'The devils believe,' said St. James, 'and tremble.' We believe and *trust*. The devils believe and tremble because they think God is hostile to them ; but because we think that God is friendly we believe and trust. The assumption, then, of religious faith is the friendliness of God.

Religious faith implies the friendship of *God*. The crown of the universe is life : the crown of life is man : the crown of man is Jesus : the crown of Jesus is the Cross. And this self-manifestation of God towards the world reaches its absolute height in Jesus' prayer on the Cross, 'Father, forgive them for they know not what they do.' It is the last word of God over against the worst deed of man. It means that God is unalterably man's friend : and as St. Paul said, If God be for us, who can be against us ?

How brittle are the piers  
On which our faith doth tread,  
No bridge below doth totter so,  
Yet none hath such a crowd.

It is as old as God,  
Indeed, 'twas built by Him ;  
He sent His Son to test the plank  
And He pronounced it firm.

What of the future ? It is not easy to sustain confidence in the future of mankind. Must it always go on like this ? Shall we go on floundering stupidly from war to war, from depression to depression for ever ? There are some good men who have concluded that this world cannot be redeemed. George Tyrrell, that fine spirit, who suffered much, came to the conclusion that this world was incurably evil, a brute rock against which men are dashed, in order to drive them in despair into the arms of God. We will not so surrender God's world to the devil. It is, after all, God's world : and what He made, He can redeem : and He is on our side !

Can we create a Christian social order in the world ? We can, because God is on our side. Can we abolish war ? We can, because God is on our side. We can do anything we want to do with this world so long as it is in tune with the mind of Christ, because God is unalterably with us. It is now up to us.

'If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye might say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou plucked up by the root, and it should obey you.' Which is a

graphic way of saying that in the whole realm of the spiritual and moral life or in the world of human relations there is no such thing as an insuperable difficulty, an insoluble problem, an impossible task.<sup>1</sup>

#### FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

##### Companying with Christ.

BY THE REVEREND J. S. MACARTHUR, B.D., M.A.,  
LLANDAFF, CARDIFF.

'But supposing him to be in the company, they went a day's journey.'—Lk 24 (R.V.).

This passage is taken from the one record that the Evangelists have preserved for us of the boyhood of our Lord. It was a great occasion, this journey to Jerusalem. We are not expressly told that it was the first time our Lord had been taken to the Holy City since His presentation in the Temple, but probably it was, for the journey from Nazareth was a considerable undertaking. In making it year by year Joseph and Mary were giving proof of a religion that cost them something. From the way in which he mentions it we can see that St. Luke is anxious to make it clear that the parents of our Lord were not among those who shirked the annual pilgrimage. Sometimes these journeys may have been irksome, but not this time, for even if their son had accompanied them before, there was a difference now. At the age of twelve a Jewish boy was admitted to full membership of the community, and this passover would be like a first communion.

But what an end to it! The sudden realization on the homeward way that their Boy was not with them, the fears for His safety—not imaginary ones either, for the country was in an unsettled state—the frenzied and unavailing search, the hurried return, and the discovery.

All this shows that it was not want of affection that had caused them to leave Him behind. Even carelessness might be too strong a word to use. They had simply taken His presence for granted, and who will blame them?

But for us to whom Christ commits Himself the incident has a solemn lesson. In our acknowledgment of Him as Lord, in our presence as worshippers in His house, we embark on a venture of faith with Christ in our company. We go on taking His presence for granted, and then one day we find that it is only supposition, and in bitterness of heart we have to retrace our steps until we discover Him once again, or rather, are found of Him, for He is seeking us all the time.

<sup>1</sup> R. Roberts, in *A Faith for To-day*, 71.

It has happened again and again in the history of the Church that churchmen thought Christ was in their company when they had really left Him behind. In the early centuries great Church Councils were held in order to draw up creeds and statements of the Church's faith. Those who took part in them did indeed acknowledge Christ as Lord, but when they began to hurl anathemas at one another, was He still in their company? In a later age it was thought a fit enterprise for Christian folk to win the Holy Land from the infidels by the sword, and those great adventures called the Crusades took place. Great adventures they were, but ill-omened from the start, for the Crusaders began by plundering the Jews to finance their expeditions, and that persecution of Christ's own people has never quite ceased from that day to this on the continent of Europe. The many deeds of valour that light up these strange military pilgrimages stand out against a squalid background of miserable rivalries and jealousies that make one wonder whether the name *Crusade* is really a fortunate one to apply to any religious enterprise to-day. Yet all the time the Crusaders supposed that Christ was in their company, the Christ who had said, 'If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight.'

Still farther down the ages came the Reformation, another great venture of faith, but were there not moments when the heroes of it too lightly took the presence of Christ for granted as they went about their work of destruction, burning the nests that the rooks might fly, to use one of their own phrases? Almost contemporaneous was the Counter Reformation, another great religious movement which sought to set the Church's house in order from within, a movement adorned by such great names as St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Francis de Sales, and St. Charles Borromeo. Yet the Inquisition with all its horrors was part of it, and the Inquisitors, too, believed that the Lord was in their company.

Just over a hundred years ago there began the Oxford Movement, which brought new life to the whole of the Anglican Communion, with its insistence on the divine mission and authority of the Church, its emphasis on the Sacraments, and its urgent call to the realization of the supernatural life here and now. All this was of God, but when Tractarians began to disturb the peace of the Church for the sake of bringing back some of the childish things that had been put away at the Reformation, was it more than supposition that the Lord was in their company?

How, then, can we be sure that the Lord is in our company? Let us turn back our thoughts to that

caravan returning from Jerusalem to Nazareth and see if we cannot find the answer to this question. The parents of Jesus supposed Him to be in their company, but of this we may be sure, that their supposition cannot have been grounded in any converse they had had with Him. During that day's trek they had done without speaking to Him. If they had called on Him by name they cannot have waited to hear His answer. It is almost certain that they had spoken about Him to each other and to their friends, but that was not enough. They could speak about Him though He Himself had been left behind.

It is just the same in the history of the Church, it is just the same with us. There can be plenty of talk about Christ yet no converse with Him. If we want to be certain that Christ is in our company it is not enough to talk about Him; we must talk with Him. And the talk must not be one-sided, for if we do all the talking we still cannot be sure. We must listen for His voice. He Himself has told us the futility of saying, Lord, Lord, and has contrasted those who do that with those who do the will of the Father, and the Father's will can only be known if we listen for His voice. That is why we so often fail in prayer. We never get away from the sound of our own voices, from the tumult of our own desires. We must indeed ask; but what preparation do we make for receiving? We must not expect that God will always speak to us directly in some mysterious way when we are on our knees, or think that we have prayed in vain when we do

not experience that peculiar feeling of God's nearness which is called sensible devotion. Our prayers ought to include thanksgiving, self-examination, the slow and careful reading of the Scriptures, especially the Gospels, with our minds and wills set on finding out what God is saying to us and commanding us in His Word. If we do this we shall certainly receive, but if we do not thus turn our eyes to God, how shall we know what He is holding out for us?

We cannot be thinking of God all the time, no matter how eagerly we may be striving to carry out His purposes. All the more reason, therefore, that we should have definite times set apart for making sure that He is in our company. It was towards the end of the day that the parents of our Lord missed Him and began to seek Him, but too often we are content to go many days' journey without making sure that He is with us. As Mary and Joseph sought Him at the day's end, so let us be mindful to let some converse with Him, however brief, hallow the ending of each day. But as they had reason to regret that they had not sought Him earlier, so we may ask ourselves whether it is wise to leave so strenuous an exercise as prayer wholly to that time of day when we are least fit for effort. Prayer, like the frankincense of the Magi, is an offering, and why should we offer unto the Lord that which doth cost us nothing? At the cost of some self-sacrifice let us begin each day, not with the supposition, but with the assurance that the Lord is in our company.

---

## Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTSHIRE.

IF *Tell el-Kheleif*, a small low mound on the north of the Gulf of Aqabah, midway between the east and west ends, be the Biblical Ezion-geber, as appears likely, the discoveries made there this year by Professor Nelson Glueck throw considerable light on Solomon's commercial and maritime activities. The *tell* is 717 yards from the shore, but this excessive distance seems to be explained by the fact that the site is exposed to the full blast of the north winds, and consequently, day in and day out, unceasing sand-storms from the Arabah have been depositing layers of sand between the *tell* and

the water. The result has been a gradual extension of the seashore southward to its present position. The discoveries show that the place was a busy industrial centre, as well as the naval base to which Solomon's ships brought the riches of Ophir (1 K 9<sup>26-28</sup>). It occupied a position at the juncture of the trade routes, along which the great caravans passed from Arabia and Sinai to Palestine, and was apparently a far more important town than the brief references in Biblical history would lead us to suppose. The industry carried on appears to have been manifold: the refining of copper, the

manufacture of copper implements (spear-heads, fish-hooks, nails, fibulæ, etc.), ship-building, fishing, weaving, pottery making, bead manufacture, and even the production of baskets, ropes, and mats. The copper-refining furnaces occupy a large part of the tell. Ten furnace-rooms have been uncovered, together with numerous rows of flue-holes (two horizontal rows on each wall), which still have a strong draught flowing through them. The site had been well chosen where the winds blow almost invariably from the one direction (the north). The working of copper deposits and their manufacture into useful articles was evidently one of Solomon's main industries. We know from Biblical history that, by an alliance with the sea-going Phœnicians of Tyre, he was enabled to build and man a fleet of merchantmen at Ezion-geber for trade with Arabia and distant Ophir (perhaps even India). These ships, when outward bound, seem to have carried cargoes of copper, both in ingots and manufactured products, returning in three years' time with gold, silver, ivory, perfumes, and other precious articles. Probably Ezion-geber was the source of the numerous copper furnishings in Solomon's royal buildings at Jerusalem, including the massive pillars Boaz and Jachin, the huge molten sea (holding 16,000 gallons of water) supported by twelve brazen oxen, the two hundred pomegranates, and many of the other adornments. The copper mines of the Arabah and the refining furnaces of Ezion-geber seem to have been to his administration what oil fields are to some modern governments, and we can understand how they brought him untold wealth (cf. 1 K 10<sup>14, 15</sup>) and led to the Queen of Sheba's visit and probably to a commercial treaty with her (cf. 1 K 10<sup>13</sup>). When we read that he left all the vessels of the temple unweighed (1 K 7<sup>47</sup>) because the bronze was so plentiful, the statement does not exaggerate. No doubt, when the Israelites first came to Ezion-geber from Kadesh (Nu 33<sup>35</sup>, Dt 2<sup>8</sup>), copper refining would be in existence in the district at that early date. The technique would be well known to the Edomites, and especially to the Kenites or 'smiths,' the tribe into which Moses married. Tubal Cain (Gn 4<sup>22</sup>), a member of this tribe, is stated to have been the first craftsman in copper and iron. Among the other industries of Ezion-geber, pottery manufacture seems to have had a prominent place. In one of the rooms opening on the street, such a large amount of fine pottery was discovered that Professor Glueck is of the view that the room may have been a store or shop for the sale of jugs and dishes.

Though no real evidence for the date of Abraham

has so far been produced by archæology, certain recent discoveries tend to bring the date nearer to the Biblical one (c. 2090 B.C.). In the Old Testament narrative he is associated chronologically with the 'cities of the plain' (cf. Gn 13, 14, 19) and referred to as contemporary with their destruction. An examination of Transjordan pottery, especially at *Bâb-ed-Drâ*, *Ader*, and other sites in the Dead Sea valley, was carried out some time ago by Professor Albright, who deduced from it that the culture and sedentary occupation of this region (Moab and Edom) came to an abrupt termination about 1800 B.C. at the latest, and consequently that the cataclysm described in Genesis probably took place about this time. This, of course, is on the assumption, for which we have no actual evidence, that the district was abandoned because of the cataclysm. For all we know, there may have been an earlier abandonment and re-occupation. But if the assumption be correct, it seemed decisive that the date of Abraham could not be placed earlier than about the end of the nineteenth century B.C., and this conclusion was supported by Professor Glueck and others. A detailed study, however, of pottery in Transjordan has recently been made by Dr. G. Ernest Wright, Old Testament Instructor in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Chicago, and recent Field Director of the American Schools of Oriental Research. It is worth noting that he puts the date of the pottery referred to back to between the twenty-third and twentieth centuries, and states, in accordance with this finding, that 'it is probably more correct' to place the end of the occupation sometime in the twentieth century, and this, too, 'after allowing for a considerable lag.' Indeed, it is doubtful, he thinks, whether 'the latest elements of the culture in this region' can be brought lower than 'the first phase' of the Middle Bronze (which began in Palestine about the twenty-first and twentieth centuries B.C.). 'The pottery of *Bâb-ed-Drâ*,' he says, 'near the southern corner of the Dead Sea is roughly contemporary with *Tell Beit Mirsim* J'—a stratum which has been dated by Albright himself to 'the late third millennium.' It would thus seem that archæological evidence is coming close to the Biblical date of Abraham, whose entry into Canaan from Haran with his Hebrew followers took place, according to Biblical chronology, about 2090 B.C.

Further reports have been made by Thureau-Dangin and Charles-F. Jean on their translation of the Mari tablets, which date from about 2050 B.C., and are mostly letters addressed to Zimrilim, the last king. So far these scholars have only been

able to deal with a minute fraction of these valuable documents (amounting to over 20,000), but their reports present several new facts bearing on the Old Testament. *First*, the name David (*Dāwīdum*) occurs under the same form as that of the great King of Israel (דָּוִד), but, strange to say, always as a common noun. Throughout the letters, for example, frequent mention is made of the assassination of the 'David' of such and such tribe or city or county. Such allusions seem to show that the term signified 'grand sheik' of a tribe, or chief ruler of a city or district. In the Bible the name is given to no one except the well-known king, and hitherto it has been supposed to be a shortened form of Dodavahu (2 Ch 20<sup>37</sup>), 'Beloved of Yahweh,' or of Dodo (2 S 23<sup>24</sup>), 'Beloved of Him' (= *Dûdu* of the Amarna Letters), but the occurrence of the name in the Mari tablets, written over a thousand years before the Jewish monarchy, may require a reconsideration of its derivation. *Second*, mention is made at this early date of the Benjamin tribes (*Benê-ia-mi-na*), and their kings or rulers (*šarrāni*), who inhabited part of Mesopotamia, and were at war with Mari. Their *Dāwīdum*, it is stated, was slain by Zimrilim. As they are mentioned along with the Habiru (Hebrews), they must have belonged to the Hebrew race, and they certainly played an important rôle at this epoch, if we are to judge from the frequent allusions to them. They are referred to as the 'children of the south,' in contrast to the Bensimâl tribes (*Benê-Si-im-a-al*) who were the 'children of the north.' It is surprising to find them mentioned in these tablets nearly two centuries before the Biblical Benjamin was born; and it is worth noting that, according to the tablets, the derivation of the name is not 'son of my right hand,' as usually interpreted (cf. Gn 35<sup>18</sup>, R.V., Margin), but rather 'son of the south' (the termination *šar* having both significations). *Third*, we find that there were two kings named Hammurabi living at the time—one the well-known King of Babylon (the sixth King of the First Dynasty), and the other the King of Kurda. There are several letters from each of them, but the frequent mention of the former shows that he occupied the chief place in the political world. His date has been a *quæstio vexata* among scholars, and it now involves that of Zimrilim, who was contemporary. According to André Parrot, the director of the excavations, the style of the material unearthed in the palace is practically identical with that occurring during the Third Dynasty of Ur (c. 2280 B.C.) and the Dynasty of Larsa which

followed (c. 2170 B.C.). This places Hammurabi much earlier than many scholars have done (Albright, e.g., puts him as late as 1870 B.C.), and bears out the date reached, after considerable research, by the late Professor Langdon of Oxford, viz., c. 2067–2024 B.C. 'The dates,' says Langdon, 'of the First Dynasty as fixed in Langdon-Fotheringham, *Venus Tablets*, p. 87, are certain, and I cannot see why anybody challenges them.'<sup>1</sup> Hammurabi thus becomes a contemporary of Abraham, and in all probability identical with Amraphel of Gn 14. It is now known that the Assyrian and Babylonian chronological lists, which have hitherto been regarded as authoritative, are not to be depended on, especially in regard to the duration of the reigns.

The last report by H. de Genouillac of the excavations at *Telloh* (ancient Lagash), in Babylonia, deals with the period covered by the Third Dynasty of Ur and the Dynasty of Larsa, to which we have referred above. There are numerous parallels in law and custom with Hebrew history. Here only two need be mentioned. One is the fact that a large number of double burials (*i.e.* husband and wife together) have been found. Whether the tombs had been reopened for the interment of the other consort, or whether the wife had been immolated on the death of her husband, remains uncertain. But, in either case, it reminds us of similar discoveries at Kish and proves the prevalence of monogamy among the inhabitants in those early days. Polygamy was undoubtedly recognized and was common, but to all intents and purposes the Babylonian appears to have been a monogamist. Similarly, among the Hebrews, it is open to question whether polygamy was at all general. The principle of one wife seems to have operated among them, although never legally insisted on. Passages like Gn 2<sup>18ff</sup> unmistakably point to this. When also the prophets represent the relation of Yahweh to His people under the figure of a marriage (Hos 2, Is 50<sup>1</sup>, etc.), it can only be a monogamous one that is thought of, for Yahweh had entered into no similar relation with any other nation besides Israel, while polygamy is represented as having its counterpart in idolatry. A second point worthy of note is that Genouillac has discovered in one of the temples the bodies of thirteen new-born children, whose deaths do not appear to have been connected with foundation ceremonies, and this corroborates once more the existence of human sacrifice. In the same way, the Israelites were not altogether free from this dreadful rite. The story of the sacrifice

<sup>1</sup> In a letter to the writer, 17th June 1936.

of Isaac goes to show that it prevailed in Israel in early times. The history of Jephthah furnishes an indubitable instance of it in the period of the Judges, and there are numerous prophetic references which seem to prove that it persisted in Israel till a late period (Mic 6<sup>7</sup>, Jer 7<sup>31</sup>, Ezk 20<sup>26</sup> 23<sup>37</sup>), though it was an alien element repudiated by conscious Yahwism.

The recent discoveries made by Gordon Loud (successor to the late Dr. Chiera) at *Khorsabâd*, ancient Dûr Sharrukin in Assyria, also touch Israelite history in many ways. It was here that Sargon II., the great conqueror who destroyed Samaria, built his beautiful city and palace (the Versailles of this Assyrian Louis XIV.) at the end of the eighth century B.C., though his grandiose design was never fully realized, for on his death in 705, his successor Sennacherib brought the capital back to Nineveh. Much of the city has now been excavated, and seven gates have been found on three fronts of the great city wall. The main point of interest to the Biblical student is that the plan of Ezekiel's temple (Ezk 40-43), especially that of the gates, seems to bear a striking resemblance in almost every particular to that of this royal city. In the case of the temple, the buildings were similarly encompassed by a quadrangular wall, the gates were on three fronts only, and each gate, like those at Dûr Sharrukin, had a narrow threshold leading into a long vestibule (which served as a 'corps de garde'), at the end of which was a second threshold (Ezk 40<sup>7</sup>), the same in all respects as the other, leading through a bay or porch into the sacred enclosure. The temple of Ezekiel was only a vision and remained such, but during the prophet's captivity in Babylon

had he heard particulars of Sargon's new capital in the far north, built a century before?

According to a statement made by Virolleaud before the French Academy, the new unpublished documents from Ras Shamra dealing with Kereth, a Sidonian king and demi-god, treat of his old age and death. As the son of the god El and the goddess Asherah, he was believed by his family to be invulnerable and immortal, but at last he was grievously wounded and succumbed like ordinary mortals. The whole story has an interesting bearing on Ps 82 ('Ye are gods . . . but ye shall die like men'), and on Ezekiel's words regarding the King of Tyre (cf. Ezk 28<sup>2-9</sup>), 'Thou hast said, I am a god . . . but thou art man, and not God, in the hand of him that woundeth thee.'

There is good evidence, as already pointed out, that Lachish was burned twice by the Assyrian forces—first about 597 B.C. just before Zedekiah was made king, and later about 587 B.C. at the close of his reign. Before the first destruction there was a distance of more than forty yards between the outer and inner gates (afterwards it was considerably reduced), with strong fortifications in between. Mr. C. H. Inge, who has been carrying on the work since Mr. Starkey's death, has pointed out that at the inner gate there is a raised cobbled barrier forming a threshold, and that in ancient times this must have been bordered by two wooden beams, as there are two grooves filled with ash where the wood appears to have been. The beams were probably used to take the bolts of the doors, and the discovery explains a passage in Neh 3<sup>3</sup>, 'The fish-gate did the sons of Hassenaah build; they laid the beams thereof, and set up the doors thereof, the bolts thereof, and the bars thereof.'

## Contributions and Comments.

### \*Οχλος in Mark ii. 4 (Luke v. 19).

Mk 2<sup>1-4</sup> (Lk 5<sup>17-19</sup>), as commonly understood, tells us that Jesus preached in some house in Capernaum; that a paralytic was to be brought to Him in order to be healed; that the people who carried him could not enter the house διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, 'because of the crowd' besieging it; and that in consequence they uncovered the roof and let the bed down that way. Now this traditional interpretation is not quite

satisfactory. For one thing, would not the crowd have made room willingly if a miracle was to be expected? And, above all, it is not easy to see how the people carrying the sick man, once the way to the door was barred, should have succeeded in taking the even more difficult route over the roof. Certainly none of these problems is insoluble.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It has been suggested that the bearers, as soon as they beheld the crowd, turned and ascended the roof from behind the house. There is, however, no textual

yet it may be worth while trying a new explanation.

One of the Hebrew equivalents of 'multitude' is שפעה. This term signifies a multitude of camels in Is 60<sup>8</sup>, of horses in Ezk 26<sup>10</sup>, and of warriors in 2 K 9<sup>17</sup>. It should be observed that the last-cited passage, וירא את שפעת יו, is rendered in the Complutensian Polyglot by ελεεν τὸν ὄχλον Εἰού. In Rabbinic literature the noun שפעה or שיפועא and the verb שפע are used in a wider sense. They refer not only to the numerical size of a collective but also to the extent in space of a particular object; in other words, they mean not only 'multitude' and 'to be numerous', but also 'great length or breadth' and 'to be wide'.<sup>1</sup> In Genesis Rabba 14. 15b, e.g., it says<sup>2</sup> that a man who has got קורה שופעת, a 'strong huge joist,' will usually place it in the centre of the room. Ex 26<sup>12</sup>, וסרה על אחרי המשכן, וסרה העדף, in the Jerusalemite Targum reads: ושיפוע מותרא. Similarly the translation of יהיה סרוח in 26<sup>13</sup> is משפע. Finally we may adduce Mishna Oholoth 7<sup>2</sup>, כל שיפועי אהלן, אהל שהוא שופע ויורד וכלה עד כאנבע, מומאה באהל כלים שחתח השיפוע מומאים; מומאה תחת השיפוע כלים שבאהל מומאין. This Mishna deals with tents smaller at the bottom than at the top. In questions of uncleanness, we are told, everything lying under the upper wider part of such a tent, even though actually outside the tent itself, shares the fate of those objects which are inside, and *vice versa*. The text runs as follows: All 'protruding parts' of a tent count as the tent itself; in the case of a tent that 'protrudes' at the top, slopes down, and is but one finger-breadth at the bottom, if there is uncleanness inside the tent, vessels under the 'protruding part' are also unclean; if there is uncleanness under the 'protruding part,' vessels inside the tent are also unclean.<sup>3</sup> It is obvious that here as in the Jerusalemite Targum שפועא does not simply mean 'hugeness.' It denotes, in a more limited sense, that portion of a thing by which it is bigger than another: the evidence. Moreover, if this was what happened, most of the people assembled would not have seen the sick man: their astonishment therefore, when he was cured, would be difficult to explain.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the Biblical use of שפע and שפעה in Dt 33<sup>19</sup>, Job 22<sup>11</sup> 38<sup>34</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> This and the following examples are quoted from J. Levy's *Neuhebräisches Wörterbuch*, and from his *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*.

<sup>3</sup> I have based myself largely on the translation given by H. Danby, *The Mishnah*.

wider part of a tent as compared with the smaller in the Mishna, the remaining part of longer curtains as compared with shorter curtains in the Targum.

Assuming, then, that ὄχλος in Mk 2<sup>4</sup> (Lk 5<sup>19</sup>) stands for שפעה or שיפועא, the reason, in the original narrative, why the paralytic could not be brought through the door may well have been that the bed was too large, the door too small. According to Mk 2<sup>3</sup> it was four men who carried the bed; this fact probably is mentioned in order to make it clear how big the bed was. Διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, on the basis of this view, would have meant in its original form: 'for the hugeness' *scil.* of the bed, or even, if שיפועא was employed in its more technical signification, 'for the protruding' of the bed. How שפעה or שיפועא came to be translated as ὄχλος may be left undecided. Seeing the Rabbinic word does frequently denote a 'multitude,' it was, perhaps, just a slip. The author of the Greek version may have had in mind v.<sup>2</sup> (Lk 5<sup>17</sup>, somewhat divergent), where indeed it is recorded that a great many people assembled to listen to Jesus: on the other hand, however, v.<sup>2</sup> is quite possibly editorial, itself a result of the ὄχλος in v.<sup>4</sup>. We may remark, in conclusion, that if the theory suggested is correct, Bab. Moed Katan 25a provides a much closer parallel than hitherto supposed. When Rab Huna died, his bed was too large to be brought out through the door.<sup>4</sup> His pupils therefore began to remove the roof. Rab Hisda however pointed out to them that this procedure would be incompatible with the respect due to a deceased Rabbi. The pupils then planned laying him on another, smaller bed. Again Rab Hisda intervened and observed that a great man like Rab Huna must be carried on his own bed. In the end they resorted to a rather rigorous course: they widened the entrance by destroying parts of the wall itself.<sup>5</sup>

DAVID DAUBE.

Cambridge.

<sup>4</sup> It may perhaps be asked how the bed was brought into the house. But, of course, the problem is much easier when there is no one lying on a bed, as one can then turn it round. This accounts also for Mk 2<sup>12</sup> (Lk 5<sup>26</sup>, Mt 9<sup>7</sup>) where we read that the paralytic, after being cured, took up his bed and walked home. Actually, the miracle partly consisted in the very fact that he was able to carry without assistance a bed of large dimensions.

<sup>5</sup> Midrash Psalms, note 10 on 24<sup>7</sup> (to which passage Mr. H. Loewe kindly draws my attention) seems also to suggest that the case of a door being too small for any big furniture to be brought in or out was not infrequent.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### The Minor Prophets.<sup>1</sup>

THIS section, by Professor Horst, completes the crisp, stimulating commentary on the Minor Prophets which has been already noticed (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlviii. 284). One or two features are worth attention. The Editor, for example, thinks that 'Chaldeans' was not in the original text of Habakkuk, but he maintains that the prophet was a contemporary of Nahum, who wrote about the year 620. He sees no definite reason for placing the last oracles in Zec 9-14 as late as the Maccabean period, though he agrees that 11<sup>4-17</sup> and 13<sup>7-9</sup> fall within the fourth or the third century. Malachi is an anonymous production; the editorial note of 4<sup>4</sup> probably refers to Ezra's law-book. Horst declines to put 3<sup>6-12</sup> after 1<sup>2-3</sup>, but he is in line with many scholars in viewing Zeph 1<sup>6</sup> and Hag 1<sup>13</sup> as glosses, as well as in transposing Hag 2<sup>15-19</sup> to its original position after 1<sup>15</sup> and in replacing the sixth verse of Zec 1 before the fifth verse. None of the prophets here discussed is so vitally important, from the religious point of view, as the earlier Amos, Hosea, and Micah, with the partial exception of Habakkuk, to whose conception of the holy God as sovereign Power Horst does justice in his comments.

### Early Church History.<sup>2</sup>

Professor Mueller's manual, since its issue in 1892, has proved a thoroughly reliable, sober, and comprehensive aid to students. In this new edition he has been assisted by a young colleague, and the result is a volume which is well up-to-date, improved by some rearrangement of the material, but essentially the same in tone and judgment. This part covers the rise and development of the Church down to the year 324, when the Civil War led to Constantine's recognition of the Church as a legal entity. It will be a service to historical study when the following sections are issued, for Mueller's history holds its own still.

### The Coming of the Kingdom.

Professor O. Cullmann, in an article contributed to the *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuse*

<sup>1</sup> *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten: Nahum bis Maleachi*, von Friedrich Horst (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen; M.4.80).

<sup>2</sup> *Kirchengeschichte*, von Karl Mueller, Erster Band, dritte Auflage; erste Lieferung (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen; RM.10.35).

(pp. 174-186), analyses the views held by early Christian writers, down to the middle of the second century, on the coming of God's Kingdom. If that event was to follow the preaching of the gospel to all pagans, as an eschatological action of God (as many believed), what were the conditions necessary for this divine intervention? The completion of the number of the elect? So Justin Martyr argued, extending this number from martyrs to good souls of every race who had been chosen and rewarded by the Lord. Occasionally, as in Hermas, this implies that pagans repent in time. But the common implication is that during the interval between the Resurrection and the End the divine purpose is active, through the Christian mission, not that any action on the part of the Church decides the final stage. Others, again, like the writer of Barnabas, calculate the time of the End in advance, relapsing on Jewish schemes of eschatology, but more often insisting on the adequate holiness of the saints, as though it were only the imperfections of the Church which retarded the coming of the Kingdom. This comes out in Second Clement, where it is mixed up with a radical, negative asceticism, again on the lines of some Jewish anticipations, and out of touch with the courageous hope of genuine Christianity. All that primitive Christians knew about the End was that the opportunity of hearing and accepting the gospel must first be put within reach of all men, and that even the preaching of the gospel and the due response of Christians to the divine vocation were divinely inspired. Apocalyptic arithmetic was a lingering inheritance from Judaism, which never belonged to the genuine passion of the Christian hope and devotion. It was one thing to say that the Kingdom could not come until God's people were truly penitent and willing in the day of His power. It was another thing to assume that this was more than the condition for the sovereign God taking action to complete His purpose, or to calculate times and seasons by means of the calendar.

### The Gospels in Armenian.

In his manual on *The Text of the Greek Bible* (p. 126), Sir Frederic Kenyon agrees that the original Armenian Version 'was presumably made from Syriac, since it shows a strong affinity to the Old Syriac in the Gospels . . . but some use may also have been made of Greek MSS.' In an impor-

tant study contributed by R. P. S. Lyonnet to the *Revue Biblique* (pp. 355-382), based in part on the evidence of pericopes in an Armenian MS at Venice, the author adduces material in the shape of readings, interpretations, and stylistic characteristics, to support the hypothesis that the Armenians first translated a Syriac Diatessaron, either Tatian's or some analogous document, and that the later versions of the Gospels reflect not only Caesarean readings due to the Constantinople Church but traces of the earlier translation. The data are admirably discussed, and the difficulties of the problem fairly faced. A strong case seems to be presented for a Syriac prototype rather than an exclusively Greek one, in order to account for the presence of Diatessaron peculiarities side by side with normal phenomena, in the extant quotations from the Gospels. The argument carries on and elaborates recent researches made by P. Paul Essabalian in his *Le Diatessaron de Tatien et la première version des Évangiles arméniens* (Vienna, 1937), as well as by the author himself in an essay printed in *Biblica* (1938, pp. 121-150).

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

### The Servant Songs.

THERE are problems connected with the 'Servant Songs' in II Isaiah which, possibly, will never be solved. Nevertheless, more light is constantly being thrown on the subject, and Sellin's discussion in the current issue of the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*<sup>1</sup> is particularly welcome. He adheres to the main outlines of the theory he propounded in 1930, and agrees with Mowinckel in believing that the Servant was the prophet of II Isaiah himself. Unlike Mowinckel, however, he holds that this writer was responsible only for the

first three of the songs; the fourth was the work of the prophet's disciple 'Trito-Isaiah,' who was not only the author of Is. 56-66, but the compiler of his master's utterances now contained in chs. 40-55. Another important contribution to exegesis is a discussion of Ps 49 by Paul Volz, who finds that it not merely indicates the survival of the individual after death, but also that it differentiates between the fate of the righteous and that of the wicked in the world to come. Two articles come under the head of higher criticism; one is a study of the history of the Decalogue by Mowinckel, who traces it from a primitive set of ritual ordinances to the final development in D and P (Ex 20). His treatment of Lv 19 is specially interesting. Alt has a short discussion on the prose sections of the Book of Job, maintaining that a distinction must be made between two elements in the epilogue. Some illuminating suggestions on the pre-exilic religion of Israel are offered by May in his discussion of solar worship in Jerusalem; there is a reply by Elliger to Hempel's comments on his earlier article dealing with the political outlook of the prophets, and Sellin, in addition to the long article already mentioned, has a note on the Ephod and the Teraphim. Philology is represented by a discussion from the pen of Euler on the meaning of *sepaer* in the Sudshin inscription, in the course of which he acutely distinguishes between the use of *kāthabh 'al sēpher* and *kāthabh b'sēpher*—a delicate but important nuance. Short notes by several scholars and the editor's invaluable 'Chronik' help to give this issue of the *Zeitschrift* even more variety than usual; it has something of importance to say on almost every side of Old Testament study.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

<sup>1</sup> Vierzehnter Band (1937), Heft 3/4 (Töpelmann, Berlin).

### Entre Nous.

Jane T. Stoddart.

The distinguished journalist, assistant editor of *The British Weekly* for nearly fifty years, Miss Jane T. Stoddart, could not write dully if she tried. In *My Harvest of the Years* she has topics in themselves full of interest, for she writes with inside knowledge of those events in the religious and political world that she came so closely into contact with. In the pages of her Memoir we company happily with the

great religious leaders in Scotland and England of this and the last generation. More than all, in these pages Robertson Nicoll lives again, and works ('I am the most industrious creature that God ever made'), and talks, and gives advice, as 'Don't worry because people muddle. People even prefer to muddle their own way than to be ordered about and directed in the smallest degree. Take these words of age.' At the end of her biography Miss

Stoddart comes back to Nicoll. 'I am sure they [her parents] would have shared my thankfulness that so great an Editor as William Robertson Nicoll not only introduced me to London journalism, but kept me with him to the end.'

The story begins with Kelso, where Miss Stoddart was born on All Souls' Day, 1863. There were no organized school games, but children learned the habit of walking for pleasure. 'Twas sixty years since, and a good world for children.' There in Kelso she laid the foundations of a sound education. The town had several good libraries, and families had well-stocked bookcases. On Sunday, games and walks were not permitted. The want of a religious newspaper was felt because church services were over by 5 o'clock in the afternoon. Kelso with its five thousand inhabitants sent worshippers to no fewer than ten churches. For those were the days of many Presbyterian churches severed by old controversies. In 1877 William Robertson Nicoll was elected, in the usual democratic way, to be minister of Kelso Free Church. From that time all interests were quickened. His *obiter dicta* were discussed in the homes. His remarkable sermons had a wide influence. In his Bible class he discovered and encouraged any kind of promise in the young people. Miss Stoddart has kept one out of the many letters that he wrote to youthful friends. After criticising some poems she had written he goes on: 'I want to know what kind of prose you write.' There was free access to Nicoll's own books. Even in Kelso his study walls were lined with books, and scattered on table and floor was a collection of newspapers and magazines.

After the Kelso chapters, Miss Stoddart writes about the life in Edinburgh in 1879 and 1880. She is only fifteen but already she is preparing for journalism. There is a very vivid account of the evangelical life of that date as it centred round the Barclay Church under Dr. Wilson's leadership. She attended the Free Church Assembly Hall in 1881 to hear the final discussion on the Robertson-Smith case. Thinking of ages and attainments to-day one cannot help marvelling at such early development and at such serious interests for a schoolgirl of sixteen. Mid-week services were taken seriously. In her first winter at school in Edinburgh, Dr. Wilson gave a course of lectures on Galatians, 'in which even his younger hearers could discern the ripe fruits of thought and experience. The area of the church was full, pews were thrown open, and the scene, as I recall it, was not unlike Dr. Campbell Morgan's Westminster Fridays. We did not often visit other churches. Dr. Alexander Whyte, already

at the height of his fame in Free St. George's, was king of one world, as Dr. Wilson of another. No one was surprised to learn that Lord Rosebery had taken Mr. Gladstone to hear him. But a sense of loyalty kept the rank and file closely attached to their own congregation; "wandering" and "sermon-tasting" were not encouraged.'

In 1887 Miss Stoddart went to London to help Robertson Nicoll, in the first place with a series of homiletic volumes. Very soon she was on the staff of *The British Weekly* and the eventful years were beginning.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have brought the story within reach of every one by publishing it at five shillings.

#### St. Francis.

There are people, of whom the present writer is one, who, finding on a cover 'our chief reader writes "this is a lovely, lovely book,"' are much inclined to lay it down. And yet in this instance—*In the Steps of St. Francis* (Rich & Cowan; 8s. 6d. net)—that would be a pity. For it is a book with many admirable qualities. Yet the chief reader has not erred, and it is just a little 'lovely, lovely.'

St. Francis of Assisi, that dear, difficult, impulsive soul, has of course a way of awakening a kind of emotional ecstasy in those who write of him as, for example, in Sabatier. And this new life flows out of the same mood. It is written by Mr. Ernest Raymond, the novelist, and he confesses that he uses his novelist's art unashamedly, and with deliberation. And why not? For one man who is much interested in the determining of certain obscure points upon which scholars differ, a score will be able to keep step with this author who 'deliberately chooses the more dramatically effective of the alternations' when things are in dispute, and sets it down with a vivid rush of words, and a kind of flutter of excitement in his own heart.

There is much reading and thinking and affection in this volume. But there is something more. Ruskin declared that ten can speak for one who can think, but that two can think for one who can see. And that power of seeing, and of making others see, is a supreme quality in a real biographer. Mr. Raymond has it and much else. It makes a fine rapid, colourful book, but it is just a little 'lovely, lovely,' in the chief reader's unintentionally cruel phrase.

#### Compromise.

'No one knows how long Francis stayed in the Holy Land. It was a considerable time, and every

learned authority has a different estimate to bedevil the unlearned and lazy. But there are two things that will hardly admit of dispute: he knelt in the sacred places, and he walked with his dreams in the tracks of his Lord. . . . There, rising behind Jericho, was the Mountain of the Third Temptation. And the Third Temptation, we agreed, was exactly the same as Francis overcame on the heights above Assisi. "All things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me."

'It is a temptation which must assail every man upon whom breaks the consciousness that he has good gifts and a talent for success: the temptation to prostitute one's genius for the sake of a numerical triumph, to sacrifice quality for quantity, to win power and applause and the kingdoms of the world by a deserting of the higher for the lower self. In the hearts of the best it may sometimes whisper like this: "If I lower the ideal a little, I can win the people for it. Surely that would be statesman-like. Surely that would be wise. But if I pursue uncompromisingly the highest of all, if I preach only perfection and the completeness of self-conquest, I shall limit the power of the message of God, and even, perhaps, slay its hope of success. Would it not be wise to compromise a little if by so doing one could capture the kingdoms of the world?"'

'Mohammed yielded to it. I hold it fair to say that he compromised with the sensuality and the combativeness of men and so won the kingdoms of the Arab world. And in a pregnant sentence, which may or may not be true, but is worthy of consideration here in the wilderness under the mountain, Dostoevsky wrote, "The Church is Christ yielding to the Third Temptation."

'But the man Jesus did not yield, nor the man Francis, whatever their followers may have done.

'And, mark you, it is a temptation which returns again and again, though its power is diminished with every defeat. It did not leave Christ for ever after the repulse up on the mountain. "The devil departed from him for a season."

'Nor did it desert Francis, though he defeated it once on the hills above Assisi. It was present with him now as he stood in the wilderness, looking up at the mountain where Christ defeated it. Were not his brothers, were not his ministers, was not the Protector, Cardinal Ugolino, urging compromise upon him and calling it prudence and the way to influence and power? I think that Francis looked up at that peak and drew strength not to yield. I think that he decided anew, with an uprush of love and consecration, to resist it to the end. And I think that, immediately after his decision, immedi-

ately after his "Get thee behind me, Satan," he felt an elation and a unity with God; for that is what happens to the least man among us in his moment of triumph over temptation.'<sup>1</sup>

### Miracles.

'A future life is, you think, unbelievable? How clear it is that death is death for men as for all living things. Well, I should myself put the matter rather differently. The present life is incredible, a future credible. Not to be twice-born, but once-born is wonderful. To be alive, actually existing, to have emerged from darkness and silence, to be here to-day is certainly incredible. A philosopher friend of mine could never, he told me, bring himself to believe in his own existence. A future life would be a miracle, and you find it difficult to believe in miracles? I, on the contrary, find it easy. They are to be expected. The starry worlds in time and space, the pageant of life, the processes of growth and reproduction, the instincts of animals, the inventiveness of Nature, the rising and setting sun, the affections and passions, the character of thought, of will, intuition, consciousness, these singly and together plunge the human mind into profound amazement to be in their midst. They are all utterly unbelievable, miracles piled on miracles

To o'erstep old Pelion or the skyish head  
of blue Olympus.

. . . Miracles? For my part I see miracles everywhere. I see nothing but works of magic. Miracles are not rare birds. They fly in flocks, they darken the sky in their multitudes. So much for miracles. Nature is not natural, but supernatural, delighting in marvels, in confounding us with the astonishing and impossible.'<sup>2</sup>

### 'For they knew His Voice.'

The Rev. Eric F. F. Bishop, of Newman School of Missions, Thābor, Jerusalem, has kindly sent us the following story, which he says is 'fairly common property in Palestine in these days.'

In one of the villages of the Northern District, which underwent punitive punishment in the early part of this year, a considerable number of sheep, goats, and other animals was 'sequestered,' but the inhabitants were permitted to redeem their own possessions at a price that was fixed. Among the sufferers was an orphan shepherd boy, whose all had been confiscated. This 'all' consisted of

<sup>1</sup> E. Raymond, *In the Steps of St. Francis*, 233 ff.

<sup>2</sup> W. Macneile Dixon, *The Human Situation*, 429 f.

six or eight sheep and goats which he went to redeem at the appointed *rendezvous*. Those in charge were, of course, willing to restore his erstwhile little flock, but rather ridiculed the idea of this being a possibility, and said that he could not possibly recognize his own sheep and goats from among the hundreds that were penned in. The little shepherd, however, thought otherwise and paying the required amount, he just gave his shepherd's call, and at once his little flock trotted out after him, 'for they knew his voice.'

#### Minos Devine.

##### GOD IN MY LIFE.

God be in my life  
And in my contriving ;  
God be in my will  
And in my deciding ;  
God be in my gain  
And in my rejoicing ;  
God be in my loss  
And in my resigning ;  
God be in my aim  
And in my aspiring ;  
God be in my end  
And in my arriving.

This poem, along with a number of others, by the late Dr. Devine, is included in the small volume—*The Poet-Preacher of Vere Street*—just published by the S.P.C.K. (2s. 6d. net). Most of the volume is occupied with nine very characteristic sermons. The quality of these will be seen from the extracts from Dr. Devine's Advent Message which we have given in 'The Christian Year' this month. The volume is enriched also with a brief memoir of the author by the Rev. F. W. Robertson Dorling, A.T.S.

#### Nursery Rhymes.

The minister of Ferme Park Baptist Church, Hornsey, the Rev. Henry Cook, M.A., has had a good and, so far as we know, an original idea for his young people's addresses. He bases each one on a nursery rhyme. Here is how he begins 'Doctor Foster.'

'Doctor Foster went to Gloster  
In a shower of rain ;  
He stepped in a puddle  
Up to his middle,  
And never went there again.

'We know nothing at all about this Doctor Foster except that he went to Gloster on this particular day. I do not, however, think he was what we

would call a medical doctor, and I shall give you two reasons for that. First, if he had been a medical doctor I do not think he would have been walking as this particular Doctor Foster was. He would almost certainly have been in a car, or, in the days before there were cars, in a gig. That is one reason. And the other is this, that if Doctor Foster had been a medical doctor he would not have done what this one did. This Doctor Foster got himself soaking wet through stepping in a puddle of rain, with the result that he never "went there again." But it is one of the greatest glories of the medical profession that a doctor never at any time considers himself. He goes out to visit his patients in all weathers and at all times of the day or night. Had this Doctor Foster been a medical doctor with a patient in Gloster, I am quite certain he would have gone back again till his patient was better, even though he got so thoroughly wet the first time.

'For these two reasons, then, I think this Doctor Foster was not a medical man. I have wondered whether he might not be John Foster the famous essayist. John Foster was a Baptist minister who lived in that part of the country in the eighteenth century. He wrote a book of essays that gave him a great reputation. But he was rather an absent-minded man, and, even though it was raining cats and dogs, I should not be surprised to learn that he was so lost in his dreams that he stepped into a puddle up to his middle. The roads in those days would make that kind of thing possible, and John Foster may have been the hero of this story.

'Anyhow, whoever this particular Doctor Foster was, and however it came about that he got himself into such a situation, the one thing we know about him is all to his credit. Having landed into such a predicament, he resolved that he would not let it happen again, and so he avoided this road to Gloster in the future, "and never went there again."

Mr. Cook then proceeds to point the moral—and right well he does it. But we must not quote him further. We must leave something to the imagination of our readers. The addresses are published by the Carey Press and the title is taken from the first talk, *Baa, Baa, Blacksheep!* (2s. 6d. net).

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.